

The South Atlantic Quarterly

Volume XXVI

OCTOBER, 1927

Number 4

KILLING THE GOOSE WITH THE GOLDEN EGGS

MARVIN McKENDREE BLACK, JR.

Louisiana State University

ONCE upon a time there lived a certain king who was fabulously wealthy. His wealth was due largely to the loyalty and painstaking efforts of his tradesmen who went into far countries distributing their wares, bringing back to their king the riches of their trade. The king was much pleased at the enormous wealth which was flowing into his kingdom, but unfortunately began to look with too covetous an eye upon the increasing prosperity of these men, and feared lest they get too powerful. Hence, having consulted his finance ministers, he increased the taxes which these tradesmen should pay unto him, hoping thereby to fill his coffers to overflowing, so that he might gloat betimes over the ever increasing pile of shining ducats before him—Alas, though, instead of receiving an ever increasing supply of gold from his subjects, lo and behold, the burden of the taxes was so great that they feared to engage in any new enterprises, for fear the king would seize upon their profits. Many ships lay idle in the harbors, door after door of the tradesmen's shops was closed, and even in his own household the king felt the want of the very necessities for his table and his court.

Thus we have exemplified what may prove to be the story of the American railroads.—Let us see what happened in 1926. First, as to the competition of motor buses and motor trucks with the railroads: At present, there is no uniform regulation governing their operation as public carriers, and what is more, in some instances, their use in such capacity has been drastically opposed. Many Chambers of Commerce

and a number of railway employees have opposed the use of motor buses and motor trucks as public carriers; Traffic Clubs have said that the public can not be served best through their use. The National Automobile Chamber of Commerce likewise has voiced its disapproval of the growing use of motor buses and motor trucks in transportation, and has suggested at least a reasonable control to prevent their having too much free play. A movement towards uniformity has been initiated by California, and two important groups, the American Electric Railway Association and the American Short Line Association, have proposed a Uniform State Regulatory Law.

Two theories seem to be extant concerning the regulation of motor buses and motor trucks in transportation; one, that the restrictions must not be so severe as to put them out of business; the other, held by the railroads (and justly so), that if motor buses and motor trucks are to be classed as public carriers, then they ought to be subject to the same type of regulation as the railroads are. Ay, and there's the rub! Just what type of regulation should the motor buses and trucks have? Two particular principles of regulation and taxation have been suggested: first, that such regulation should be in state, rather than local hands, but that the Interstate Commerce Commission should regulate interstate movements; second, that the owner of such motor bus or motor truck used in the public service should secure a certificate of convenience and necessity ere he is allowed to operate. The main idea in each of these, then, seems to be to place motor buses and motor trucks in the class of public utilities.

Although many may agree as to some regulation of the type just mentioned, yet upon the subject of taxation of motor buses and motor trucks there is considerable controversy. For, indeed, how shall motor buses and motor trucks be taxed? According to their wear and tear on the public highways, or upon some specified income basis? The railroads themselves, in numbers of instances, have gained permission to abandon a part of their lines, substituting therefor motor buses and

motor trucks, for it is true that on short hauls there is a decided advantage in the use of motor transportation. This is especially true of what is known as "store-door deliveries", which result in the saving of haulage charges and also in the saving of time. Much buying nowadays is "hand-to-mouth," due partly to just this feature of motor transportation. The railroads, for the most part, are not fighting the competition of motor buses and motor trucks, for they realize that their increased and continued use is inevitable, but on the other hand, where possible, they are supplementing their lines with motor transportation, and it is only a question of time before motor buses and motor trucks will be under federal regulation, just as the railroads now are. Yet, whatever that regulation may be, the operators of motor buses and motor trucks should be allowed a reasonable return upon their investment, and taxes should not be so severe as to strangle highway transportation.

The next phase of railroad developments of particular interest during the past year was the continued part played by the Shippers Regional Advisory Boards in promoting coöperation between the railroads and shippers, and the improvement of service in matters where the shippers, the public, and the railroads were concerned. The first joint meeting of the Shippers Regional Advisory Board was held in Chicago on January 7, 1926, and there many problems of the shippers and carriers, and the conduct of the various Shippers Regional Advisory Boards, were thrashed out. The plan of the Shippers Regional Advisory Boards corresponds somewhat to the Federal Reserve System in that there are twelve districts whose territories are similar to the Federal Reserve Districts. In substance, the local Shippers Regional Advisory Boards are simply intermediaries between the railroads and shippers and the Interstate Commerce Commission at Washington. Each Regional Board usually meets quarterly to thrash out local questions and to redress local grievances, in order to relieve the Commission from having to attend to every single quarrel that might arise between an irate shipper and the railroad which failed to give him the kind of service he thought he

deserved. But if nothing else can be done to quiet the wrath of such a shipper, of course, he can appeal to the Commission at Washington.

It is interesting to note, however, that very few such cases ever have to go before the Interstate Commerce Commission, for increased coöperation between the public and the railroads has been brought about to such an extent by means of these Shippers Regional Advisory Boards that the need for the regulation of problems by either state or national government has almost completely disappeared. These Boards bring the shipper, the public, and the railroads into close contact with each other to coördinate their interests with respect to matters of service, and as a result each has come to a better understanding of the other's views. This has established a new economic plane for the business relationships of the future, and from these Boards has come the lesson that national business can be successfully carried on only as a unit. This new cycle of progress, termed by Mr. Aishton, President of the American Association of Railways, the "law of coöperation" is the same factor harped upon by the railway executives of the country in that they advocate voluntary rather than compulsory relationships. Aside from the general results of coöperation, these Shippers Regional Advisory Boards have brought about definite tangible results in the saving of time and the movement of commodities. They have served to eliminate car shortage; they have lessened congestion; they have been able to render service never before equalled in that they have found out the particular needs of the shipper in each locality. Better service means the more rapid movement of commodities from one section to another, and that in turn has a beneficial effect upon the commercial, financial, and industrial life of the country as a whole.

The proposed amendments to the Consolidation feature of the Transportation Act of 1920 is of interest in that if passed, it will be a guiding factor for the subsequent consolidation of railroads. Under the law as it stands today, the Interstate Commerce Commission has to prepare a complete plan before-

hand, and any proposed consolidation must be in conformity with that preconceived plan ere it will be allowed. That necessarily burdens the Commission unduly, and the new Parker Consolidation Plan would allow the railroads to consolidate voluntarily with the approval of the Commission, to be on trial for at least five years. This amendment just mentioned is simply one out of many pending at the present time to govern railroad policy. Truly, there are a multitude of them, entirely too numerous to mention, and we can only mention a few in passing.

The proposed repeal of the Pullman Surcharge is of particular significance in that if it goes into effect, the earnings of the railroads, particularly those of the western group, will be decreased to quite an extent. Of course no one is anxious to pay the surcharge, but the point is, how else shall those railroads which have been operating at a loss recoup that deficit? Among other bills pending, we find seven to revise the Interstate Commerce Commission, either to enlarge it or to provide for Regional Commissions to aid it in its multitudinous tasks; one, to reduce the rates on cotton, wheat and corn by 50 per cent.; another, to repeal the Re-capture Clause which allows the railroads only $5\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. return; and five bills to eliminate the provision of the Transportation Act which requires carriers to get a certificate of convenience and necessity from the Commission before engaging in any new projects. The chief tendencies of all amendments pending seem to fall into two groups: those leaning toward direct legislation by Congress, and those to relieve the Commission in some measure from its ever increasing tasks.

Last year, beyond a doubt, was the greatest year in the history of the railroads. Car loadings were greater, and freight traffic surpassed all previous records, the largest increase since 1917. Total earnings were the largest in history, and the net operating income was the largest for any one year. The railways were more active in the point of construction than at any time since the war in that the mileage of new lines completed was 35 per cent. greater than in 1925. Operating

costs were reduced by reducing the number of employees, and the improvement in locomotives, cars, shop-equipment, tracks, terminals, signaling, and automatic train control was striking. In fact, nothing seems to have been left undone that would aid the railroads in rendering the best service possible, and 1927 has promise of being an even greater year than the one just past.

Yet, we must not be misled by the totals giving the total net operating income of the railroads last year, for a close scrutiny of individual incomes of some of the railroads brings out startling revelations, in that many roads ran on a deficit. Many of those whose incomes did show an increase did so mainly because of artificial conditions. The railroads that showed an improvement in earnings are primarily of two groups: those engaged in the carrying of bituminous coal, and secondly those carrying anthracite. The first group consists of the carriers in the Pocohontas section, the Norfolk and Western, the Chesapeake and Ohio, and the Virginian Railway. These roads enjoyed such an advantage in the handling of coal by reason of the British coal strike, which was not settled until the end of November, and gave rise to an enormous demand for coal to fill the needs of the British Isles. It goes without saying that the Pennsylvania Railroad, the largest coal carrying road in the country, reported a gain in net earnings, and we find also that the Baltimore and Ohio, another large coal carrier, showed a gain in net earnings. Among the anthracite carriers, a number of roads show gains: the Reading, the Delaware and Hudson, the Erie, and the Lehigh Valley. The gains of the anthracite carriers were due chiefly to the recovery of large losses in the same period last year when the coal strike was in full blast.

Let us glance for a moment at the other side of the picture: During the month of November, 1926, the railroads of the South suffered losses chiefly because of recession in business occasioned by the big slump in the price of cotton, and the collapse of the big real estate boom in Florida. Of these, during November, all with the exception of the Southern Rail-

way and the Yazoo and Mississippi Valley suffered losses. Among them were the Atlantic Coast Line, the Louisville and Nashville, the Florida East Coast, and the Seaboard. In the West, too, large losses are found, for the low level of agricultural prices caused a lull in business as evidenced by the diminished purchasing power of the farmers in that section. The Union Pacific, the Southern Pacific, the Northern Pacific, the Chicago Northwestern, and the St. Louis and San Francisco all suffered losses in net operating revenue for the month of November, 1926. These losses were bad enough as they were, but had it not been for the contribution made by reason of the Pullman Surcharge, the diminution in net revenue would have been even greater. If the Surcharge is abolished, some \$16,000,000 will be cut from the passenger revenues of the western railroads, and some \$40,000,000 annually will be cut from the passenger revenues of the entire railroad system of the United States—for, at best, the profit does not come from the passenger traffic. The basis of the Pullman Surcharge is for a greater service furnished at a greater cost to the railroads. Yet, in spite of these facts, there are many who would abolish the Surcharge, believing, we suppose, that by some wave of the hand and an "Abracadabra" the necessary revenue will instantaneously appear, or that by a mere rubbing of the lamp, some genie will arise laden with chests of gold!

The full importance of transportation in the life of our country is excellently portrayed by Dr. C. S. Duncan, Economist of the American Association of Railway Executives. He says: "There is probably no other economic factor which more vitally concerns the daily life and welfare of every one than the safe and prompt transportation of passengers and property.—To take care of the enormous job of transportation, the railways are organized into a tremendous machine, representing an investment, on the part of Class I railroads, of more than \$21,400,000,000. The railroads are called upon to furnish adequate transportation service, to have the right kind of a car at the right place, at the right time, to make a

prompt and safe delivery at the point of destination." That the railroads did furnish adequate transportation we very well know, but if they are to continue their splendid service in the future, large capital outlays are necessary, and with increasing transportation needs increasing expenses follow. Of the expense items of the railways, the two greatest are the tax bill and the wage bill—the former last year vaulted, leaped, and catapulted to heights hitherto unknown. According to Mr. Otterback, Assistant to the Chairman of the Western Railways Committee on Public Relations, for every dollar paid in dividends to the stockholders, a dollar and five cents went to the government in taxes. A particular instance of an advance in the wage bill was the increase in wages granted to conductors and trainmen of the eastern railways. Nevertheless, there are those who still feel that the railroads are earning more than they ought in spite of the fact that last year sixteen railroads operated at a loss, and the total net operating income of Class I roads was only 5.13 per cent—not even the so-called "fair return" of 5.75 per cent allowed by the Commission. And yet, we still expect the railroads to buy new equipment, to extend their lines, and to exert every effort towards furnishing greater transportation service! Such a thing, if it were not so tragic, would be laughable. One might as well attempt to build a Woolworth building with the wages of a street-sweeper!

To sum up, then, the logic of the railroad situation shows us that adequate, efficient, and economical transportation is vitally necessary to the economic life of our country; that in order to furnish such transportation, and to render the best service possible, the railroads have to spend large sums of money; that the money necessary must be secured from earnings or from the money markets of the country; but whether from either source, a friendly public attitude and adequate returns are prerequisite. The attitude of the public towards railroads is growing more and more favorable day by day—already a number of railroads are selling their common stock to the public—and we find that the idea of coöperation

between the shipper, the roads, and the public has increased to such an extent that great improvements in service have been made possible. Yet, unfortunately, there are many individuals who believe that the railroads exist only to be regulated, restricted, and shackled with law, either to compel them to consolidate, or to legislate directly against them in other ways. What the railways need most is not to be wrapped about with thick blankets of legislation that will suffocate and check their activities, but supervision, and a kindly policy of let-alone—at least to the extent of allowing them to earn not merely an arbitrary “fair return”, but to earn a substantial return which will permit them to furnish to the public that service in transportation which is essential to the general welfare of our country.

ARE WE AMERICANIZING THE IMMIGRANT?

HAROLD FIELDS

Executive Director, The League for American Citizenship

I

WHAT ARE we really doing to make Americans of our immigrants? We have a large group in this country that feels we should emulate Mother Goose—wasn't it little Bo-Peep?—when we were told to

"Leave them alone
And they'll come home" . . .

and let the alien gradually transform himself into an American through his own choice of instrument. There are others who are firm adherents of the principle of interference. The truth or falsity of both theories is a subject all of itself. The fact that confronts us is this—we are evidently *trying* to make Americans of our aliens; but what are we doing to accomplish that end?

This question has impressed itself upon me, more and more, as my years of service in this field of special work have rolled by. From the beginning my conclusions have always been the same: our social workers and educators understand the problem sympathetically, but there is so great an infiltration into their activities of outsiders who know the alien but little, that great harm is done. They do not understand the keen problems that confront our immigrants. I never weary telling the story of the young Polish girl who is being mentally tortured by our regulations. She is a divorcee, her husband having been found guilty of adultery. She is also a citizen because he had been naturalized before they married. Yet each time she goes abroad—and that takes places often because she is the buyer of one of the departments of a well-known store—she must suffer herself to be listed as a divorcee despite the fact that the courts have granted her the use of her maiden name. She must show her marriage certificate, her divorce papers, her writ that grants her the use of her former name,

and a copy of her former husband's citizenship certificate, with the result that she is embarrassed and frequently the subject of suggestive approaches on board ship. If only she could be granted her papers in her own name, since no contention is offered against her citizenship status, all this re-awakening and rehashing of the past could considerably be dispensed with. But the government demands it of her three or four times a year, with the result that she is seriously considering dropping a very lucrative, honest, and promising position in order to be spared these unhappy situations. Nor is she alone.

Consider for a moment the questionable value of Americanization processes that send the immigrant from location to location when he seeks to become an American Citizen; consider his righteous anger when he is told that he is penalized for having complied with the laws (a condition that is quite common); consider his disheartening conclusions when he finds all his lawful efforts fruitless and inconsequential. An analysis of our method of procedure plainly shows that we are stressing too much the mechanics of the process of Americanization and overlooking the more salient factor—the spirit. As a people we are forcing the issue of "citizenship papers" and divorcing it entirely from a true sympathy and appreciative understanding of the character of our government. Such an issue is, by its very nature, destructive. We are building up laws and tearing down faith. We are shutting our ears to the sounds of protests that come from those whom we seek to Americanize. We are alienating the aliens. Quite recently I had occasion to interview a deportee just before he was sailing abroad. For fifteen years he had resided amongst us. During all that time he had been a law-abiding, conscientious, and upright citizen—in all but the legal fact, as I shall explain soon. When the war broke out, he gave two sons to our cause—enlisted men, not drafted. He prospered and held a position of dignity in his community. He had taken out his first papers shortly after he had arrived and had been under the impression that they constituted full citizenship. Then in 1923 he went back to his native land to visit old friends and re-awaken memories in the haunts of his youth.

He played vacation for a long time. He wrote his brother to manage his business until his return, received a very satisfactory report, and decided to stay longer. Finally, in 1925 he returned to find himself an alien. He learned that his first papers were not citizenship papers and that he had been misinformed. He was without a proper visa and was told he could not enter this country. He told me he felt like a man who was being ordered to stay away from his own home by an utter stranger. His whole career had been established here. His two sons lay buried here. His community respected him. One can easily understand, then, why he went to Canada and smuggled himself in. He was found—and with bitter denunciation of the unfairness of our laws, was perforce accepting deportation. Also his denunciation was being mouthed by others of his community and by countless others who learned his story. Because he had not been properly instructed concerning the true character of his first papers, because he had voted for years, because no authoritative statement was made to him of the legal permissibility of foreign residence, he found all his contributions to this country, to its welfare, to its progress, wiped out. In him a real American had been alienated; through him countless aliens were soon de-Americanized.

Experience has shown that to encourage the alien to become an American is to impress him with a spirit of helpfulness, of friendliness. Private and public agencies stress too much the science of government and emphasize too little the meaning of respect for, and true knowledge of, our institutions. While not true in every case, this is so, all too often. They talk opportunity and forget to mention obligation. They urge the alien on to citizenship, overlooking the handicaps of countless unnecessary obstacles. In official procedure we surround the alien's logical requests for more consideration in and out of immigration centers and naturalization courts with needless technical difficulties. Organizations that seek to aid these aliens but are not cognizant of these basic weaknesses, are unfortunately common. Their motives are laudable,—but not their means. The true work of Americanizing our foreign-

born residents lies in working through and with them, rather than by means of speeches or tracts or public meetings. It seems simple to understand that the foreigner evaluates Americanization work in terms of a real understanding of his purposes in coming here, his difficulties in living here, and his interpretation of his environment here. So long as societies and persons engaged in this task study these backgrounds and make use of these studies, just so long will there be an enthusiastic and warm response; so long as they attack the problem in a patronizing and superior manner, just that long will they achieve nothing of permanent value—unless it be to create mutual misunderstandings. Perhaps the best illustration that can be offered of a type of organization that has been doing this work properly is the League for American Citizenship—the pioneer in this field and probably the most widely known throughout the country for this specific type of activity. It does its work through the medium and agency of the foreign-born themselves, endeavoring to employ those who speak the alien's language and carrying on a program by sympathetic methods that has called forth commendation by native-born and foreign-born alike. Such procedure will never alienate aliens; it is certain to weld a strong and sincere bond of appreciation that will make real Americans of our present aliens.

II

These people who come to us from foreign shores are by no means uncultured or illiterate. In expressing themselves in our language, they are; but in their desires and longings there are found indices that point to unspoken hopes. And yet, although they bring to us cultural "mores," an economic urge, and youthful dreams and ambitions, our natural tendency is to subdue them all, and when they have died, to attack their absence. That seems to be the ultimate result of our present tendencies. We class all aliens as "the immigrant," not realizing that when the average foreigner reaches these shores, he resents being classed with the others who have come with him. He feels he is different from his fellow-alien. He asserts that his heritage, his cultural background, his intel-

lectual capacity are such as to preclude his being merged in the classification of "the immigrant." He believes this intensely. Our ignoring it does not help the situation at all. He believes it whether he is of the peasant or the educated group. You see this best when you mingle with them socially. There is no subject too deep and no topic too profound to fail to interest all of them. It seems rather absurd to watch their intense interest at concerts, at exhibitions, at lectures or at forums, and then say that they lack culture—or a desire for education—or an intense longing to be better than they are.

Unfortunately, there seems to be little desire for a sympathetic understanding of these mental traits of the immigrant. These alien visitors of ours come from many lands and bring to our shores a common characteristic, that of a sensitive superiority—a sense of superiority that is based on suppressed dreams and aspirations that have been suddenly set free. And when such dreams are suddenly become infused with the flow of life, even though they do not exist in fact but are found only in the individual's own consciousness, there is certain to be evidenced a fierce spirit of resentment against any intrusion or rude awakening. Often this resentment is registered against the grouping that merges superior and inferior classes. We see it in our own midst when our native born shy at being associated with the foreign born. We find the spirit of caste and class strong in all of us.

With this characteristic as his background, a background perhaps unwarranted but certainly factual, the alien does not understand why he is being merged with the "the immigrant" group. The Russian dreamer or the artistic Frenchman or the sensitive Italian, who comes here, finds his reception to our shores beset with conflicting regulations, with harsh restrictions, with technicalities often inhuman and inconsiderate. He gets a rather unwelcome reception. It is hardly conducive to his becoming friendly to America. He is sorely perplexed. This treatment leaves him bewildered. He cannot understand what it is that America wants of him—nor why. In fact, when he lands and after he has come, he is constantly questioning. Why this talk of registration—must he revert

to the evils he has just escaped? Why this sudden fear of deportation? Why link foreigners with bootleggers—why not bring in the native-born who encourage them through their own purchases? Why these incessant and unpleasant statistics of foreign born and criminals, foreign born and the insane, foreign born and immoral persons—foreign born with all those guilty of social crimes and physical diseases? Why? Is this our form of introduction to the land in which he is to live? Is this our method of inculcating love and respect for the new land? It hardly smacks of justice.

The immigrant, especially he who is but newly arrived, cannot understand this attitude or treatment. The older residents do not understand. And the still older *will* not understand. Students treat it not as the aftermath of a war, but rather as the strange psychological condition that usually accompanies complacent sensibilities. This psychogeny is *our* earnest of superiority. We evidence it in one form by an insistence on a stern line of demarcation between the alien, or immigrant, and the rest of us. We begin with immigration. We restrict it. We cut down the numbers of arrivals. We maintain we have at last begun to treat the annual additions to our population with sense and discrimination. Though our return to "normalcy" has been too fast and sudden for us to take this step slowly and scientifically, we feel we have created—or discovered—a new and valuable science in the philosophy of immigration. And to prove it, when the end of the year is come, we herald our statistics: "*Less Than 300,000 Have Come As Compared With the Million Who Were Ready and Anxious!*" We go further. We analyze the occupations of the new arrivals and learn that most of them are laborers, workers, artisans—excellent economic material. We sit back contented. We have fulfilled our mission. In the smugness of our mental state of comfort, we have impressed an harassed minority with a most important observation—the value of discrimination and the higher importance it gives to those who practice it. In truth, we revel in our excellent judgment; we believed we possessed it; now we are convinced.

What a blow to the poor Russian dreamer, the artistic

Frenchman, the sensitive Italian,—for to them, this is Americanization. This is the first twist of the screw each must feel. It is not for any of them to sympathize nor analyze. They know the number of arrivals has decreased. But they also know that the basis of choice was a mere figure—the precedence of visa numbers rather than any one immigrant's ability or fitness. They note the lessened numbers—and the immigrant must perforce be silent; by circumstance and by heritage, he is a polyglot minority. Aye, he might even go further—he might prove, if he chose, the falsity of the doctrine that holds the quota to be of economic advantage. He could produce facts that would indicate that when the immigrant applies for his declaration of intention (first papers), within a few weeks after his arrival, his occupation as stated on his application is remarkably different from that entered on the ship's manifest and on his immigrant record. I know of a case where a Swedish farmer, so registered on his visa, applied for his first papers giving his occupation as a clerk. I know a Danish immigrant who came in as a professional man, and who two weeks later registered as a laborer; I know an Englishman whose occupation aboard ship was stated to be that of an artist, and who the very first day of his arrival gave his occupation as that of a business man. In such fashion does the immigrant silently register his impression of the quota system as a campaign against him. He feels that it is unscientific and ill-chosen. He sees that it does not select but merely accepts at random. Yet he cannot and dare not protest; he knows there is nothing so infallible as smugness.

I had occasion only recently to question an Austrian about this very question. His explanation of the situation was naive—and simple. "You see," he said, "to us in Austria, America looms up as a haven. Our economic condition—if such chaos can be called a condition,—our generally disrupted circumstances, the unsettled attitude of the minds of our people have been the more vivid because of the unconscious comparisons with our fellow countrymen in the United States. To get here, as you can understand, we are willing to pose in any capacity. We hunger to partake of your high standard

of living. We want to be part of an industrial system where such sanitation and considerate surroundings are to be found. Your wages ring loud in our ears. The picture of athletic fields, workmen's homes, rest periods and hospitals provided by the company employing help, read like fairyland. Can you blame us for craving to reach this land of helpfulness and life? Can't you understand the hunger for freedom from misery and privation? We make every effort then to attain it. We have been told that as unskilled laborers, we will not be given much consideration when applying for a visa; so we adopt new occupations until we reach here and then fit into the first groove we find."

I have no hesitancy in accepting this as a generalization, for it confirms the hundreds of other explanations that have been made to me about this question. It only vindicates an attitude about the weakness of our law.

III

But we do not stop here in our desire to impress the alien with our superiority. I am thinking now of certain national organizations, a study of which reads like a bombastic boast of our worth and virtue and integrity. And as a country, we recently stirred up a hornet's nest by our attitude on "moral turpitude." Today, we advocate registering the alien to the exclusion of the citizen,—a scheme that proposes annexing to our laws all the vicious stipulations contained in similar past statutes of Russia, of Germany, of Austria. This very phase of Americanization is worthy of individual consideration, for it seems that we now feel that registration is a very effective means of impressing the alien with a proper sense of his actual status in the community. In other words, he cannot but realize how uncertain, how indefinite, how vague it really is. Of course, we are too hurried and too content to gauge the real meaning of registration to the alien. We forget, or perhaps it is that we are ignorant of the conditions attendant to the policy of registration in the land of the immigrant's nativity. *We* forget—but the immigrant does not. We attempt to justify it by saying that even citizens register at

election times. We excuse it by saying it is for the purpose of checking those aliens who are here illegally. We stress the fact that those who have nothing to fear, have nothing to lose. And more than all—and here we play our trump card—we insist it will bring us in contact with the very ones who need education and Americanization. The second screw has been twisted into the flesh of the alien. Ask him how he reacts to the policy of registration! He will tell you. Is he cattle that he must be branded? Is he criminal that he must be watched? Is he undesirable?—then why let him in? He is cognizant of another “superior” pressure, weak in its purpose but strong in its effect. Its import is not lost on him. It is another charge against him that will make him bow to the higher intelligence of the native and the acquired American. Registration to him, because of his antecedent history, means police supervision, restricted opportunities, spying, distrust of fellow-men. Across the background of hope that he has painted for our country there has appeared a shadow—the shadow of fear of state authority, rather than the light of respect for it. Over this fertile land, untrammelled with scourges or famines, and overgrown in his imagination with fair flowers and sweet fruits for those who toil by honest labor, there has swept a cold, dank wind that has robbed the fruit of its taste, the flower of its fragrance, the home of its warmth. Honest toil is no longer assured of honest returns.

Another blunder is the attempt to justify registration by logic, instead of frankly calling it by its real name of discrimination or superiority, or snobbishness. How do we ever hope to make friendly Americans of aliens to whom we are hostile? How can respect and love for our institutions be instilled when our very methods result in creating fear and suspicion? We even go so far as to parallel the registration of the alien with that of the American! Yet what a travesty on truth, what hypocrisy! Does the American report the removal of his residence? Or his arrests? Or pay a fee annually for such “service”? If he fails to register at election time is he imprisoned, or fined? The alien reads between the lines and finds the gulf broadened that separates him from the spirit of

America. He who has been allowed to enter this land where he is told he is welcomed, remains to hold our government in disdain and fear. He has found that it adopts the vicious practices of other nations and destroys the good will it has created. Its registration proposals do not even emulate the good points of other countries—nor exist for the particular purpose of such registration laws as are found, for example, in France. There can be no reply to the natural conclusion that this attitude can result only in encouraging unlawful acts among those whom it really desires to guide aright, and create deep displeasure among those of whom it seeks to make friends. When these conclusions are proved, smugness only buttons its coat more closely, shrugs its shoulders, and goes on.

IV

Returning to the subject of all these charges, how can we expect the immigrant to answer or measure them? Must he prove his own innocence? How can he? Must he prove his own worth? By what? Must he humbly accept the stigma of inferiority, the bitterness of abuse, the brand of the hounded? Then why invite him here?

Unfortunate as is this attitude, so unfortunately do we continue it. We continue stirring up dissensions. Instead of banishing the illegal and undesirable immigrants, we but start a wave that culminates in a tide of evasion and resentment. We increase its force by successive legislative proposals of similar sort. We hurl upon the storm of class-distinction a threat of deportation and thus add fury to the fears and suspicions and hates. We call forth the worst in the immigrant, not the best. No matter how long his residence in our midst, no matter how valuable his contributions, we hang the sword of Damocles over his head—and threaten his daily existence. We encourage falsehood and law evasion. Surely our experience with the "enforcement" of Prohibition should be sufficient warrant to convince any right-thinking individual of the harm of passing unenforceable laws. Yet, these bills that propose registration and deportation are lacking still more than that in legal and political power. If ever passed, they will

be a caricature on law enforcement; they will create an hostile spirit among our immigrants.

If we study the basis for these theories, we find it is this spirit of contentedness, of self-satisfaction, of smugness that exists—and something else. It is ignorance—not ignorance of our history, nor of our economic conditions, but ignorance of the immigrant's native environment and emigrant purposes, and of the alien's psychical construction. For example, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the past session of Congress was composed of representatives chiefly from the West and South—representatives of those sections of the United States where the real immigrant is little known and less understood; it is in those localities that he usually receives least education and poorest aid in Americanization. Those sections leave him to himself and blame him for his lack of progress; they say the fault is his. They remain ignorant of his untranslated hopes and aspirations. Yet they legislate for him. Here is ignorance that is costly.

I have served on numberless committees that have considered phases of the immigrant's problems, and where those committees have been national, I have always been impressed by the little that is done for the alien outside of our large Eastern centers. No organizations invite him to become assimilated. Schools are distant, and often closed at night. The immigrant's efforts to get assistance are futile because they are not couched in English—a language still unknown to him because of the lack of proper agencies. A moment's consideration of the conditions of the Poles in the mining regions of Pennsylvania, the Danes in Minnesota, the Germans in North Dakota, and, generally, of the Great Lakes bordered by Jugoslavs, Roumanians, the Dutch, Lithuanians, Swedes, Norwegians, proves this. Compare their knowledge of our language and our institutions with that of their kinsmen in New York, in Boston, in Chicago. In the latter three places, due principally to the intensive work of private organizations, the bulk of our naturalized citizens is found. There the foreigner is met more than half way and encouraged to become an American in spirit as well as in fact. But in the former

regions of the West and South no such effort is made; conditions in those localities still remain distinctly foreign. Yet, despite these glaring facts, it is on the customs and habits of the aliens of such sections that our national legislation is based. Such legislation is but a corrective vainly applied from without rather than curing the ailment from within. I repeat that such ignorance of the basic facts is costly.

Along our Pacific coast, our immigration problem is different. Our policy of exclusion is peculiar to those states. They have but little knowledge of the real character of the immigrant, for he comes in largest numbers from Europe, and his "invasion" reaches their shores only after it has imbibed much of America in its laborious trip across the continent. And as for the South?—its understanding of the problem is best gleaned from the fact that it undoubtedly contains the largest percentage of native-born Americans. All these sections of our country rear legislators who create an invidious class distinction based on a weak foundation. Georgia and Iowa, South Carolina and Washington, Tennessee and Utah were represented in the majority of the Committee on Immigration but New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts were in the minority. The Senate Committee on Immigration boasted three senators from the West, three from the South, two from the New England states, and *one* each from Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York—a group complexion that was strongly centered around those states where little immigration is found. Nor was the House Committee any different: there were four representatives from the West, five from the South, four from the mid-West, and two each from Pennsylvania and New York. With such a line-up can the immigrant expect an intelligent view of his problem in our national legislative program?—or a real understanding of his hopes and dreams?—or a true appraisal of his pattern in our American life? I doubt it. The one hundred fifty bills that were introduced in the last session were almost all amazingly intelligent in their character; however, almost all that were kindly were introduced by representatives from immigrant states or sections. And of these one hundred fifty, only six were passed—

six poor, lonesome laws that were the remnants of an earnest plea for human consideration. We, of America, who must admit we do not seek to gauge the immigrant's individual characteristics, do not hesitate to pass laws regulating his existence, sweeping aside ruthlessly his feelings, his reactions, his aspirations, his fervor. We venture to destroy what we wish to create.

Yet if only Americans as a whole made a study of the forward steps that the immigrant is ready to take, they could not but be impressed with his eagerness to be helped and his willingness to improve. An excellent instance of this is to be seen in New York City. We find that here he forms fully ninety percent of our evening school population—that tired and exhausted, he and his fellow-alien yet give their evenings over to advancing themselves and to learning to feel at home in this country. They send their children to school and keep them there at tremendous costs. They begin to think in terms of becoming independent owners of business instead of mere workmen—an attitude that makes for virility, independence, and faith. Their aim is to become “Americanized”—in speech, in clothing, in bearing, in character.

Much criticism has been heaped on the foreign-born for their gregarious, herding habits. We have a Jewish quarter, a Chinatown, a Little Italy, a Russian section, others. Great has been the rancor that has been the result of this living together, and small has been the attention paid to its progress. Sociologists and real-estate dealers—a strange grouping, to be sure—have testified that our foreigners are constantly moving from their own kind. Later, as they become assimilated, as our language becomes their language, as our customs and views are made theirs, they yearn for improved living conditions—and seek them. Here, in New York City, our East Siders have moved to Harlem, then to the Bronx, and then spread out over Riverside Drive and Washington Heights. They seek better living quarters, more sanitary surroundings, happier arrangements. Their living conditions and the buildings which they erect are more artistic and more commodious. Witness the new West Bronx developments—almost 100 per-

cent conceived, financed and built by our "unassimilable" foreigners and referred to recently by a prominent English writer as superior to the buildings of ancient Rome.

However, we even go further. We level our guns not only at this Russian dreamer, that artistic Frenchman, the sensitive Italian, and their fellow foreigners, but at their press as well. We call it alien, bolshevistic, radical, inimical. We cry for its removal. We blame it for our ills. We insist that it be shorn of its fangs and its sharp teeth. We seek not alone to harass the individual, but to tear asunder the only ties that bind him to his fellow countrymen, in his first years of American life. Yesterday it was deportation—"Hundreds of Thousands of Immigrants Don't Want to be Americans! The Secretary of Labor Estimates That 7,000,000 of Our Residents Are Not Natives and Not Americans!" The hue and cry are on. We seek to oust those who do not seek to be Americans. We ask, what do they seek here? Why do they stay in our midst? And first we put the blame on the foreign-press.

Well, what about the foreign language press? Is it alien in spirit, radical in content, inimical in its attitude? It is worthy of careful study because the immigrant depends on it for his education and information. Without it, he would subscribe to his home paper, printed abroad. But with the presence here of a press in his native tongue, he feels happier and safer. Yet, I wonder how many of its opponents have ever read it? I have, and I have found that its pages are consistently open to matters that are American in content: notices about naturalization, about pending laws, about government institutions are always welcomed and printed. And that, mark you, is not the case with the American press. The foreign-language press very openly states that it exists to link the old with the new, or to explain the new through the old, if you prefer that. The few radical sheets that exist among the twelve hundred printed publications in foreign tongues are of comparatively little moment in this field. With insignificant exceptions all the foreign-language press is thoroughly American in spirit. Some have columns in English to bridge the gap. A very good example of this is the Jewish *Forward*.

Virtually all are giving space to news of this country, rather than that of their native lands. During the war, they were among our staunchest supporters in creating patriots; since the war they have ranked first in creating an interest in citizenship. The evil that is done these sheets by this widespread abuse is but another evidence of an un-understanding and un-appreciative group anxious to show its sub-conscious sense of superiority. What it cannot understand is axiomatically wrong, false, evil. Yet the alien, knowing the patriotism of his "home-sheet," bewilderingly gazes at his accusers and wonders what they want, what it is they seek. The foreign-language press is helping toward assimilation—the type of assimilation that contains the nuclei of valuable foreign cultures that should be retained. It is tending toward making a people proud of their heritage and prouder of their newly acquired status. It is encouraging them to be of the select—urging again and again the postulates of virtue and honor and industry on its fellow-countrymen. Such an agent should not ignorantly be condemned. It should be fostered.

V

What the immigrant is aiming at, when he arrives here, is a home. That is most easily proven by the large numbers of foreign-born buyers of our suburban dwellings. Across the river from New York, a recent home development was quickly bought up; 85 percent of the purchasers were foreigners. They were of Jewish, Italian, Syrian, Hungarian, English, Irish and Czecho-Slovak stock. They were so imbued with the spirit of American independence that they were endeavoring to throw off the yoke of economic dependence. Such ambition and sinew and hope in a new people cannot possibly tolerate insults to national character and personal pride. It refuses to recognize that a few criminals put a stigma upon a whole people; it disdains a reasoning that creates a national ill-will and ogre out of specific instances of wrong. These people do not say that because a cabinet officer is accused of bribery or proven of incompetence that Americans as a whole bear the same reputation. Until we can realize that frame of mind,

we are far removed from even gleaning the temper of the rancid objections of our invited guests.

Attacks on the immigrant or on his foreign-language press, unless directed to the specific complaint, are wholly subversive of goodwill and friendship. They are destructive and unfortunate. In dealing with human beings, as we are, we must not presuppose that because they speak a different language they are different beings. Let agencies both public and private, let individuals, American and alien, remember that our spirit and not our laws makes for a single-handed people. Till then the pattern of our body politic, of our social group, of our industrial texture, will be a confused mass of native-born superiorities, Americanized foreign-born snobberies, and imposed alien inferiorities. For harmony of design and color, we must soften and kindle the spirit. But till then we will continue to alienate the alien and fail to "Americanize" him.

The immigrant has woven strands of cultures and loves, strong and beautiful, into the tapestry of American life. Spread before us, such a tapestry presents a rare pattern of mixed and mingled colors than can be presented to posterity as a contribution of rare worth. It is for us to preserve, not to destroy it. We can let the warm colors of the American spirit be its guiding genius rather than the drab effort of a made-to-order citizen, clothed in "second papers," and breathing the dullness of a misunderstanding and blindly-groping alien. We can enhance the warmth and beauty of the tapestry's design; we can enhance it by a sympathetic, courteous, chivalric and considerate approach.

BROTHER JONATHAN TO JOHN BULL

ROBERT E. SPILLER

Swarthmore College

DURING the half-century following the War of Independence there were many Americans in England and many Englishmen in America scribbling their impressions in note-books. In general, the reactions of the Americans were favorable; of the Englishmen, unfavorable. Reverence and ambition on the one hand, and hurt pride on the other, caused the scales of feeling to be far from level.

Accounts of Englishmen's impressions of America and of Americans' impressions of England have both been given at length, but there seems to have been little said about the American retort to the English attack. For the most part, American travelers themselves had not much to say, but there were, none the less, answers to the English assertions. Magazines and newspapers of the younger country contained frequent letters and articles in protest, the presses put forth extended treatises on American and English institutions, and the private correspondence of the day contained much which was of a controversial nature.

Most of this form of writing has died with the issues which it discussed, but there is a small part of it which, because of the element of satire, may perhaps merit further consideration. Satire can occasionally live even after it has ceased to be controversially active, especially when it bears directly on the development of a distinctive national culture.

During the time that the discussion of the American destiny was at its height—roughly the first fifty years of the last century,—a half dozen or more Americans, all of them with reputations in some other field of literature, contributed burlesque or fictitious travel books to the debate. Some of these authors represented themselves as Englishmen who, through a mere sense of justice, felt called upon to give a true picture of America; and others as Americans, who, finding that con-

ditions in England were, after all, not as perfect as were supposed, were led to give an exposé of the truth. A few genuine travelers also wrote books which may be regarded more as burlesques than as real records of their impressions.

Royall Tyler, playwright and judge, was the first to venture into the field with his *Yankey in London* (1809). Even old Dr. William Wells, pastor of the First Church of Brattleboro, was completely fooled by this anonymous little volume, although he knew both England and Tyler well.

"By the way, Judge," he said to the latter one day, "have you read a little work lately published, said to be written by an American in London? A capital thing; he has hit off the English Parliament to the life."

"What do you think of it?" asked Tyler. "You can judge better than we who have never been there."

"I think no doubt the young man has been there," replied the clergyman, "and seen and heard what he vouches for; and he has described many things very graphically."¹

The old gentleman would appear rather gullible to any present day reader of Tyler's book, for the information in it is obviously derived from reading rather than from experience. Only one volume of the work was published; the second, promised on the basis of the reception accorded the first, seems never to have appeared. The letters are supposedly addressed by the author, a young American living for nine months in London, to his friends in and near Boston. After cloaking his inexact knowledge and his avoidance of the specific with the statement that he had refrained from intimate contact in order to see England and the English in better perspective, he proceeds with his task of "hitting off" the English Parliament.

To this subject he devotes three of his letters. According to his own formula, the best method of obtaining a "correct view of the administration of government" in England was by reading "five ministerial and ten opposition pamphlets; three letters to a noble lord; two speeches on the state of the nation,

¹ *Grandmother Tyler's Book*, (New York, 1925), p. 295.

intended to be spoken in Parliament; an acrostic upon the minister; a rebus and a charade upon a popular leader, and a conundrum on the heir apparent."

Whatever his real sources or motives, he wasted little love upon these august assemblages. "The House of Lords," he says, "is to the House of Commons, in point of decorum, what the Opera House is to Drury Lane Theatre. Here is no shilling gallery, no cat-calls, no vulgar vociferation; but then even an opera is not without its absurdities. It exhibits heroes in recitative, dancing princes, and British lions, who, like Nick Bottom, 'can roar you like any sucking dove.'"

In both he was careful to discover analogues for the abuses and absurdities which Cobbett and his fellows had witnessed in the American Congress: three-day speeches consisting chiefly of preambles, rigid party lines which made debate mere ritual, clamor, confusion, and betting on horses in the lulls between bursts of oratorical fireworks.

The Englishman in America likewise comes in for his share of ridicule. He is pictured as escaping from the brilliant Boston sun by retreating to a smith's shop, closing all doors and the flue in the chimney, and breathing with great relish a home-made London fog which was rising from a fire of damp earth coal. Vanity, Tyler finds to be the key-word to this gentleman's character, as well as to that of the English at large. The national pride extended from military prowess to an unspeakable climate, supreme at every step.

There is practically no note of admiration in Tyler's summary, but there is also little bitterness. He is frank and far-reaching in his criticism, but there is too much playfulness in him to allow of any pettiness. Besides, his wife testifies that this book had been written several years earlier, before national jealousies had become national antagonisms. He is obviously irritated at the English attitude toward America, but he can still be good-natured in his retorts.

The same thing can scarcely be said of *Inchiquin, The Jesuit's Letters, during a Late Residence in the United States of America* (1810), by Charles J. Ingersoll. The fame of

these letters is not altogether due to their literary merit. They were published on the eve of the Second War with England, when the feeling between the two countries was daily growing more tense, and, largely by chance, they became the focal point of much of the hatred and jealousy with which the journalistic atmosphere was then filled.

Ingersoll knew both England and America. He was a native of Philadelphia and had traveled in Europe with Rufus King some years before this time. The immediate inspiration for his letters is not given, but the direction of their aim is apparent. Seldom has such an elaborate fictional device been invented for so obvious a purpose. Charlemont, a fiery young Jesuit, writes from Paris to Inchiquin in America, asking for exact information of the young country. The latter, also engaged in the revival of the suppressed order, has been forced to leave his home in Ireland and is now a refugee. When Charlemont is seized and thrown into prison, his friend, Pharamond, forwards his letter, and renews the plea for truth about the Western savages.

"What of the sex?" Charlemont enquires. "Pray do not fail to give us details of their appearance, manners, and education (if they have any) in America. . . . I have always understood that they marry early, breed fast, fade soon, and die young."

To this query Pharamond adds solicitous wonder about "those shores, where pestilence and trade contend the fate of a new empire." Surely here was enough to bait the prejudiced English reader and make him finish the book in the hope of finding more such morsels. But no: the ground must be even further prepared and the unpleasant truth approached by more gradual stages. Inchiquin, so he says, had met a certain Caravan, a traveler from Greece, in an American inn, and this gentleman, like Tom Moore, must be allowed to write of his experiences in

This embryo capital, where Fancy sees
Squares in morasses, obelisks in trees.

Like Moore, also, Caravan had ventured

O'er lake and marsh, through fevers and through fogs,
Midst bears and yankees, democrats and frogs.

But even greater terrors were in store for him. Straying carelessly too far from his inn one day, he became hopelessly lost in the jungle of the American capital. Before he had found his way back, several adventures had overtaken him. He had met both the British and French ambassadors chasing rabbits through the forest with dog and gun; he had had lunch in a Negro cabin; he had dropped in on a duel in a clearing just in time to see a gentleman shot through the heart; he had stumbled upon a hippodrome in progress in a great open field; he had been overturned in a hackney coach; and, as darkness approached, he had witnessed a group of Negroes or savages on the verge of a wild cannibalistic feast, when interrupted by a storm. The night was spent in a rude log cabin in which the host, his wife, and the three boys slept in one bed, the two daughters in another, and the guest was permitted to lie on the floor.

Certainly a prize of some sort for fiction should go to Ingersoll were it not that his inspiration had been derived from travel accounts of America, and his art is merely that of exaggeration. At this point he turns to a direct statement of some of his opinions, but, with his usual caution, he starts with those which are somewhat unfavorable to America. He criticizes certain undesirable qualities in Adams and Jefferson before he finally lets himself go in a eulogy of Marshall's *Washington* and Barlow's *Columbiad* as the high points in American literature. The design of the latter he found to be "vast and bold, more so than any other except Milton's" and, although he confesses that his compatriot is somewhat lacking in poetic invention, he is not afraid to accept the challenge of a comparison of his work with that of "any of the meter-mongers of the day, the present writers of song in England."

Letter VIII is the real objective, however. In it he takes up the Americans with respect to: "1. Their origin and population; 2. Their provincial diversities; 3. Their natural and

political associations; 4. Its moral results; and, lastly, their resources and prospects." "The American people," he cries, "dispersed over an immense territory, abounding in all the means of commercial greatness, to whom an opportunity was presented at an early period of adapting their government to their circumstances, followed the manifest order of nature, when they adopted a free, republican, commercial federation." The remainder of Inchiquin's book is an effort to prove this thesis. It is a direct essay upon America's greatness.

For several years Ingersoll's carefully laid bait lay untouched. Then, in 1814, the biggest game of them all swallowed it whole. The *Quarterly Review* published a long article in January of that year, dealing mainly with the letters in question, but broadly with the American people and their institutions. Southey was assumed by both Dwight and Paulding to be the author of this tirade, but he denied the responsibility and it has since been assigned by Mr. Worthington C. Ford to Sir James Barrow. Following this notice, references to Inchiquin were frequent in both England and America for many years, and were always the occasion of stormy language on one side or the other. Timothy Dwight was soberly annoyed, Robert Walsh was stirred to a long and elaborate defense, Paulding snarled, and the *North American* and *Edinburgh Reviews* were chief among the journals which entered the debate. It was many years before the rancor wholly died away.

The War of 1812 marked a development in the Americans' attitude. Their feeling of bitterness increased with their self-assurance; and the even more frequent travel books by Englishmen who visited America also served to irritate the stay-at-home who had offered them hospitality. In the next quarter century the most offensive of these works were published, particularly those of Basil Hall, Mrs. Trollope, and Captain Hamilton. Dickens' *American Notes* came in 1842. These writers, together with many others of less fame, made generalized statement on the basis of particular instances and thereby irritated the Americans beyond measure. Those who

retorted by writing burlesque travelogues were a rather distinguished group: James K. Paulding, James Fenimore Cooper, Laurie Todd, and possibly, although the identification is not certain, Edgar Allan Poe.

Paulding tried his hand at almost every possible medium of attack. Like Tyler, he never left America, but his *Sketch of Old England by A New England Man* (1822) is a much more ambitious but a less successful undertaking than the latter's *Yankey*. It was reviewed in the *Quarterly* for January, 1824, and rather naturally assumed to be a "compilation from radical newspapers, treasonable pamphlets, blasphemous libels, vulgar jest books, and all that species of ribald literature." Paulding's analysis of the royal "care taken to instill and preserve a sense of dependence and inferiority," in contrast to the state of personal liberty in the United States, was not well planned to soothe the wounds of verbal battle. "I shall not 'set down aught in malice,'" he says, yet "your true-born Englishman, raised and nurtured in the hotbed of home-bred conceit, and pampered with his own praises, seems of opinion that a man cannot love his country, without hating and abusing every other."

On the other hand, *John Bull in America; or The New Munchausen* (1825) parallels Ingersoll's plan of fictitious travels in the new land. In his preface the anonymous editor describes the appearance in the Mansion Hotel, Washington, of a stranger, obviously from England, who was "dressed in a blue frock, striped vest, and gray pantaloons; was about five feet ten, as is supposed, and had a nose like a potato." A mysterious Frenchman arrived later and the Englishman vanished, presumably a victim of foul play, but not without leaving a manuscript behind him. Who he was might only be conjectured, but the manuscript, a book of travels in America, would suggest "the superintendent of American affairs in the *Quarterly Review*," for "the same classical severity and mildness of rebuke, where rebuke is necessary—the same happy aptitude in the selection of choice flowers of rhetoric—the same amiable zeal for religion—the same charity to all men—the same

principles of universal benevolence—the same gentlemanly observance of the slightest minutiae of high-wrought and refined good breeding, runs through each and all of these productions.” This “Great Unknown” could not be Southey, because that poet had disliked republicans ever since they had failed to show a proper respect for his verse; it could not be Disraeli, because that amiable gentleman was too much absorbed with scandal and the ladies to concern himself with lesser matters; the editor, Gifford, could prove an alibi; therefore the author must be “The Talking Potato”, because he seemed to be talking with a hot potato in his mouth. Further than this Paulding does not push the identification, but we may sample his gentlemanly rhetoric on almost any page, as when he casually refers more than once to “the arrogant, self-sufficient, bundling, gouging, guessing, drinking, dirking, spitting, chewing, pig-stealing, impious genius of democracy.”

This pleasing effusion was followed in 1835 by a revision of *The Diverting History of John Bull and Brother Jonathan*, by *Hector Bullus*, published several years previously but now brought up to date with the latest anti-American slanders, and by *The Bucktails* (1847), a comedy written in collaboration with his son, Washington Irving Paulding.

The *History* diverts in terms of burlesque allegory. It seems that Squire Bull was jealous of Brother Jonathan's success as a farmer and set about to pick his pockets and defame his character by paying spies to pry into his private affairs (the English travelers in America). “These poor rogues of scribblers that John hired,” continues Paulding, “were glad enough to earn an honest penny in this way, seeing they were sometimes pretty hard run for a dinner; and it was a saying among them, ‘that a man must eat though he lies for it.’ Accordingly, they set to work to earn an honest livelihood by belaboring honest Jonathan pretty handsomely, as we shall see.” The chief English visitors to come in for a share of this abuse were Farmer Parkinson, Lawyer Janson, a smart young prig, De Goose (De Roos), Peter Porcupine (Cobbett), Captain All (Basil Hall), and an ugly old trollope dressed up as a lady (Mrs. Trollope).

Paulding's fictional contribution to the debate has more bitterness than those of certain of his predecessors, but his racy journalistic style makes his criticisms, particularly his *John Bull in America*, very readable. If he had followed his friend, Washington Irving, to the scenes of which he writes, he might have turned a genuine gift for satire into more fruitful channels.

Cooper's *Notions of the Americans, Picked up by a Travelling Bachelor* (1828) is a work of more real value. Cooper's indignation has a dignity which that of his predecessors lacked, although he is as prone to exaggerated enthusiasm as any of them. This book was his first extended expression of his disapproval of either English or American life, and is particularly significant in connection with his later attacks on American provincialism. As the traveling bachelor, an imaginary visitor from England, he sees his native country through the rosier of glasses. Careful of his facts, but convinced in his enthusiasms, he approaches the basic problems of American life and treats them with the directness and the sincerity which is characteristic of all his controversial writings. Theoretically he was a convinced democrat and much of his book is devoted to an exposition of this ideal, with illustrations from the life about him, together with prophecies of continued development along the same lines. Occasionally he attacks evidences of crudity in American manners, and for slavery he has no tolerance whatever. His chief points are direct answers to the attacks of the English travelers: Washington is not a wilderness; Indians and wild beasts do not roam the streets of the principal American cities; manners in the new world are less reserved than those in the old, but are nevertheless in good taste; women are accorded more and not less consideration than they are in Europe; and, above all, the country is young and must be judged in terms of its inherent vigor and of its ideals, rather than unfairly compared to Europe in its attainments.

Cooper's intentions were good and his plan seemingly excellent, but, like most enthusiasts, he neglected to take human

nature into account. Those who read his book were already prejudiced one way or the other and either applauded its truth or dismissed it as a collection of bragging lies. It ran into several editions in the immediately succeeding years, but only one was published in England, a fact which in itself is an eloquent testimonial to its frigid reception by the readers who needed it most.

For a few years thereafter the controversy seems to have lulled, until it was renewed by Mrs. Trollope, the mother of the novelist, with her *Domestic Manners of the Americans*. "Now, sure am I," exclaims Grant Thorburn, seedsman of New York and frequent contributor to the current journals, "that no woman, having the feelings of a woman, would ever expose, if she could, the failings and frailties of her sisters, and in such language, too, as that book contains—more like the licentious slang of some minor theatre, or the polluted breath of some London fishwife. If it has been written by a woman, thank God we have no such women in America."

Thorburn, or Laurie Todd—for he is better known by his pen-name—was one of the most eccentric literary characters that this country has produced. Much of his fame may be attributed to the fact that John Galt, the English novelist, paraphrased his autobiography and made him the hero of a story. He had a rambling mind and a varied career. He was born in Scotland, but some liberal opinions caused him to flee to America at the age of 21. In 1818 and again in 1834 he returned to visit his father, and on the latter occasion he wrote a few letters to the *Knickerbocker Magazine*. To these he added further comments on miscellaneous matters and published, in 1835, his *Men and Manners in Britain, or a Bone to Gnaw for the Trollopes, Fidlers, etc.*

Thorburn's provincialism and his love of satire are illustrated in the fact that, on seeing the House of Commons, he was immediately reminded of the Scotch Presbyterian Church, in Cedar Street. The only differences were that a gilded throne took the place of the pulpit and the Speaker, instead of clerical robes, wore a great wig with two tails, each as large

as the tail of a merino sheep. The members he found unimpressive, and his conclusion was that "the House of Commons is common enough."

English society presented some genuine problems to the American merchant. "It was the twelfth day of the new moon," he says,² "when I put on my best black suit, and, looking as smooth as a country parson, hired a carriage and went to dine at Lord B—'s. There were twelve persons at table, and six servants in splendid livery to wait upon them. Having previously got a few glimpses of high life, I felt some confidence that I could support my part pretty well. The mistress of the feast sat at the head of the table, and at her right hand a young lady, a Miss C—. I was placed on *her* right, while the eldest daughter of the family, a lovely girl of seventeen, sat on *my* right hand—thus placing me between the two. When I looked at the servants, with their powdered heads, and coats of scarlet—at the 'vessels of gold and the vessels of silver'—at the jars of china and platters of glass—at the countesses, and the earls, and the duchesses—at the apartment, whose seats, sofas, ottomans, and footstools outshone all that I had read of eastern luxury and splendor, and at the gas-lamps and chandeliers, which set forth a blaze more brilliant than a London winter's sun,—I say, when I looked upon all these things, I thought it was rather 'going ahead' of anything of the kind I had ever seen; and I was afraid that, in such a scene, I might commit some blunder."

Such description is hardly to be taken seriously, however serious the situation might have been for Laurie Todd. He is a manifestation of an American reaction to an English attitude. A more extended, though less humorous evidence of the same thing appeared when Charles Dickens published his *American Notes* in 1842. The *Yankee Nation*, a Boston paper, issued a supplement which was titled *English Notes*, by *Quarles Quickens*. Although the author has not been finally identified, Mr. Joseph Jackson, who discovered and edited this satire a few years ago, made out an apparently convincing case

² Letter No. 4 in the *Knickerbocker Magazine*. Vol. IV (1834), p. 393. The passage is slightly revised in the book.

for Edgar Allan Poe.³ The fictitious travel book parallels the genuine for some chapters and burlesques it point by point.

There were undoubtedly other books of this sort, but these few will serve to give an insight into the English attitude and the American reaction. William Austin's *Letters from London* (1804), the earliest American book of travels in England, is so full of general criticism as to suggest that the author was likewise drawing information from books rather than from experience; and the Rev. Heman Humphrey added to his *Short Tour in 1835* a burlesque of the English Travel records in order to show that he was above such short-sightedness as they demonstrated. Similarly, the aggressive John Neal, a man not unlike Laurie Todd, pushed his way into forbidden circles of English society and had much to say in ironical vein both while he was there and after he returned.⁴

The one characteristic which is most apparent in this curious group of books is the provincialism of their authors. Many of them had not left America at the time they expressed these opinions and drew these grotesque sketches. They felt that their country's good name was being attacked and they hurried to the rescue with such weapons as they had. There is a vigor and a determination for justice in all, and many were genuine humorists as well. It would be a mistake to confine our laughter to their errors. Behind all their wrath and bluster was a sincere belief in democracy. It was the energy of such men which finally disproved the English belief in the eventual dissolution of the Union.

The sources of the English criticism were two: the journals, of which the *Quarterly* was the most violent aggressor, and the English travelers in America, of whom Mrs. Trollope was the type. Both of these agencies fed that ignorance of the American people which made the average Englishman of the time cry with the surprise; "Why, you can't be from America. You are not a savage and you speak English almost

³ Cf. Hervey Allen: *Israfel*, (New York, 1926), I, (introduction) viii. Mr. Mr. Allen states that, after a thorough investigation, he is convinced that this item can not be assigned to Poe. The bulk of opinion seems to be in agreement with him.

⁴ Spiller: *The American in England*, (New York, 1926), pp. 310-14.

as well as we do ourselves." This is a story which is told more than once by the visitor from America.

Neither side of the debate was malicious at the start. No doubt there was in the English attitude some feeling of "sour grapes" at the loss of troublesome colonies and some jealousy of the increasing prosperity of the United States. The bitterness of each side augmented that of the other and finally called forth some masterful examples of abuse. All of this was aided by the English desire to curb emigration to America, and by the American determination to rival England in everything she did on land or sea.

There was nothing to lessen the growing feeling of antagonism until America proved to herself and to the world that she was to be counted among the great powers, and England finally realized that her former colony was a sister and not a child. The advent of the steamship, which made intercourse between the two countries so common that travel books became again practically superfluous, was a contributory factor. In the light of these conditions it is hard for us to realize to-day what our forefathers did and endured in their struggle for recognition. The battlefield told a comparatively small part of the story. This handful of books, perhaps deservedly neglected for so long, gives at least one more side-light on the period of our national adolescence.

JEFFERSON AND ADAMS AT EASE

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON

University of North Carolina

ONE OF the most striking happenings of the past two years has been the revival of keen popular interest in the life, character, and thought of Thomas Jefferson. At no time since his death, a century ago, has such attention been paid him. Consideration of him has inevitably, to some extent, focused attention also on John Adams, his great contemporary and associate. Devoted friends, with one estrangement, through many years, their careers had a notable similarity. Both were prominent in the Revolutionary history of their states, both, after service in Congress, were ministers to foreign countries, Vice-President, and President. Both lived full, rich and active years after retirement from public service, and, despite party differences, they were in striking agreement concerning men, policies, and events. Their correspondence, during these later years, recently in part republished, is evidence of this. So closely were they associated and so fully were they sympathetic with each other that their simultaneous passing seems to the student of their lives scarcely a remarkable coincidence, but merely the natural thing.

In active political life each made striking contributions to American government and thought, shaping national destiny significantly; but great as this feature of their lives was, it should not obscure the fine rounding up and finish of their labors in the years following upon retirement from public service. These years meant for most men of their age, in the phraseology of the time, *otium cum dignitate*, but to them only emancipation from public responsibility and opportunity for increased mental and physical activity. Hence this period of retirement throws light on conditions a century ago in two such varying environments as Massachusetts and Virginia, and also gives examples not unworthy of note by Americans of today.

No public men have ever shown in retirement any finer

poise, sanity, and dignity than did these two. Eagerly patriotic though they were, neither had any inclination to force his views upon those in office or to constitute himself a censor of his successors. Neither was inclined to carping criticism. They were both industrious, active-minded, tolerant, liberal, and strikingly progressive. Together in spirit and in the companionship of active correspondence, they grew old graciously and gracefully.

The similarity of their public careers, already alluded to, continued to some extent in private life. Both retired to the agricultural pursuits from which they were to gain their living. There was a difference here, it is true. Adams went to a New England farm of one hundred acres in Quincy, cultivated by himself with the aid of hired labor; Jefferson to the oversight of more than ten thousand acres, eighteen hundred of which were in cultivation, and of two hundred slaves. Adams on his farm raised a variety of products—hay of several kinds, potatoes, corn, barley, onions, and cabbages. Jefferson was limited to staple crops, such as slaves could cultivate, mainly tobacco and wheat. He also raised cattle, hogs, and sheep. Both grew fruit, chiefly apples, in some abundance, and both had vegetables from which their tables were richly supplied. The Adams farm, under its owner's own eye, was highly profitable; Jefferson's extensive plantations failed to make a living for his household. But it is fair to add, the simple living of the Adams household imposed no such burden as did the extravagant necessities of Monticello.

Jefferson was born to the soil and believed to his dying day that "those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God." It is not of record, however, that in all his life he ever did a day's work—of actual farm labor, that is—on his plantation. To Adams the taste for agriculture came later. He describes it all in his diary. In 1762 he was visiting at the homes of several acquaintances, all farmers, where there was much proud comparison of results. "We had a good deal of conversation upon husbandry," records Adams. Two days later occurs a delightful entry outlining the sudden dream that

had come to him, all of which was realized in the years which followed:

24th. Sunday. Before sunrise. My thoughts have taken a sudden turn to husbandry. Have contracted with Jo. Field to clear my swamp, and to build me a long string of stone wall and with Isaac to build me sixteen rods more, and with Jo. Field to build me six rods more. And my thoughts are running continually from the orchard to the pasture, and from thence to the swamp, and thence to the house and barn and land adjoining. Sometimes I am at the orchard ploughing up acre after acre, planting, pruning apple-trees, mending fences, carting dung; sometimes in the pasture, digging stones, clearing bushes, pruning trees, building wall to redeem posts and rails; and sometimes removing bottom trees down to my house; sometimes I am at the old swamp, burning bushes, digging stumps and roots, cutting ditches across the meadows and against my uncle; and against the brook; and am sometimes ploughing the upland with six yoke of oxen, and planting corn, potatoes, &c., and digging up the meadows and sowing onions, planting cabbages, &c., &c. Sometimes I am at the homestead, running cross fences, and planting potatoes by the acre, and corn by the two acres, and running a ditch along the line between me and Field, and a fence along the brook against my brother, and another ditch in the middle from Field's line to the meadows. Sometimes am carting gravel from the neighboring hills, and sometimes dust from the streets upon the fresh meadows, and sometimes ploughing, sometimes digging those meadows to introduce clover and other English grasses.

Under the spur of this dream he began regular farming, investing all his savings in land which gave him, as it turned out, provision and occupation for his old age.

Each left the White House for a home of the dignity befitting one who had been President. Neither was wealthy, though Jefferson's large estate and notable mansion gave the impression of unlimited means. The Adams home, "Montezillo," as he apparently called it, had been built in 1731 by Leonard Vassall, a retired West Indian planter. A Tory in the Revolution, he left Massachusetts, and his house coming into the possession of patriot relatives, was purchased from them by Adams.

The house, which is still standing, is a wooden one, comfortable and substantial, but utterly unpretentious, broad-fronted, with a vine-covered portico breaking the austerity of its lines. Adams added to it, nearly doubling its size, and it was later altered several times. In later years it was often

called the "Golden Wedding House," because three successive generations of the family celebrated there a fiftieth anniversary.

The house was set back from the road and was somewhat lower. A wall enclosed the lawn and garden, the former narrow in front but broadening out on the south side. The flower and kitchen gardens were on the north side and back of them was a very productive orchard, which extended to the wooded portion of the farm. Across the road to the west was a walk called "President's Lane", leading to the top of "President's Hill", which commanded a magnificent view of the sea and of the surrounding country. It was a favorite walk of Adams, who went there "every morning to see the sun rise, and every evening to see the sun set." Here, years later, the first Charles Francis Adams built a home.

The interior of the house was more ornate than the exterior, the parlor, for example, being panelled from floor to ceiling with mahogany which Mrs. Adams, with characteristic love of cheer and light, had had painted white. Much of the furniture, also, was of mahogany. In the house were Gilbert Stuart portraits of Adams and his wife, and of John Quincy Adams and his wife, the Browne portrait of Jefferson, the Savage portraits of Washington and Martha Washington. There were a number of portraits of lesser note, and also busts of Washington and John Quincy Adams. The whole place was full of books.

Monticello, Jefferson's home, was begun by him in 1770 and not completed until 1803. For its location Jefferson cut down the top of a small mountain to a plateau six hundred feet long and two hundred feet wide. The house, designed and built by him, is of mixed Doric and Ionic architecture and was, and still is, one of the best known and most beautiful residences in the United States. From it the view is superb—the horizon unbroken all around from southwest to northeast, except for one pyramid-shaped mountain fifty miles away. Much of this view in Jefferson's time was of untouched forest. To the north, west, and southwest are the mountains—Southwest, Blue Ridge, and Ragged—in splendid vista.

The inside of the house was in keeping with the beauty of the exterior, the decorations having been planned by Jefferson and executed under his direction. It, too, was full of books. Here also were many paintings and busts—paintings of Americus Vespucius, Columbus, Locke, Bacon, Washington, Adams, Franklin, and Madison; busts of Napoleon, Voltaire, Turgot, Franklin, LaFayette, John Paul Jones, Emperor Alexander, Jefferson (the famous Ceracchi bust mentioned in his will) and—astonishing to those unfamiliar with Jefferson's tolerance and his admiration of genius—Alexander Hamilton.

Both homes were fortunate in their mistresses. Mrs. Adams was in herself, without reference to her husband's fame, a notable personality. Intellectually gifted, she was, at the same time, an ideal wife, mother, and presiding genius of a home. No woman ever deserved better the title of helpmeet. Of kindly disposition, though possessed of more than a mere flash of fire, she was of cheerful and optimistic temper. "I am a mortal enemy," she wrote, "to anything but a cheerful countenance and a merry heart, which Solomon tells us, does good like a medicine." Certainly she was at all times good medicine for John Adams—whom she not only loved, but deeply admired—a balm for feelings often sorely wounded, a tonic for his mind and spirit. Her wit and her sunny cheerfulness made the home a place of perpetual brightness.

She was persistently industrious, hating, as she said, "merely to vegetate," and in one of her delightful letters to her daughter, she has given us the most complete picture extant of life at Montezillo:

Six o'clock. Rose; and in imitation of his Britanic Majesty, kindled my own fire. Went to the stairs, as usual, to summon George and Charles. Returned to my chamber, dressed myself. No one stirred. Called a second time, with a voice a little raised.

Seven o'clock. Blockheads not out of bed. Girls in motion. Mean, when I hire another man-servant, that he shall come for *one call*.

Eight o'clock. Fires made. Breakfast prepared. —L—in Boston. Mrs. A— at the tea-board. Forgot the sausages. Susan's recollection brought them upon the table.

Enter Ann. "Ma'am, the man is come with coal." "Go, call George to assist him." (*Exit Ann.*)

Enter Charles. "Mr. B. is come with cheese, turnips, &c. Where are they to be put?" "I will attend to him myself." (*Exit Charles.*)
Just seated at the table again.

Enter George with "Ma'am, here is a man with a drove of pigs." A consultation is held upon this important subject, the result of which is the purchase of two spotted swine.

Nine o'clock. *Enter Nathaniel*, from the upper house, with a message for sundries; and black Thomas's daughter, for sundries. Attended to all these concerns. A little out of sorts that I could not finish my breakfast. Note: never to be incommoded with trifles.

Enter George Adams, from the post-office,—a large packet from Russia, and from the valley also. Avaunt, all cares,—I put you aside,—and thus I find good news from a far country,—children, grandchildren all well. I had no expectation of hearing from Russia this winter, and the pleasure was the greater to obtain letters of so recent a date, and to learn that the family were all in health. For this blessing give I thanks.

At twelve o'clock, by a previous engagement, I was to call at Mr. G—'s, for cousin B. Smith to accompany me to the bridge at Quincy-port, being the first day of passing it. The day was pleasant; the scenery delightful. Passed both bridges, and entered Hingham. Returned before three o'clock. Dined and,

At five went to Mr. T. G—'s, with your Grandfather, the third visit he has made with us *in the week*; and let me whisper to you he played at whist with Mr. J. G—, who was as ready and accurate as though he had both eyes to see with. Returned.

At nine, sat down and wrote a letter.

At eleven, retired to bed. We do not so every week. I tell you as one of the marvels of the age. By all this, you will learn that grandmother has got rid of her croaking, and that grandfather is in good health, and that both of us are as tranquil as that bald old fellow, called Time, will let us be.

And here I was interrupted in my narrative.

After her death in 1818 a son, Judge Thomas B. Adams, with his wife and six children came to live with Adams. Another son had died just as he left the White House, and his daughter, Mrs. Smith, had died in 1813. John Quincy Adams was kept away during most of these years by public duties, but when he was in America he paid at least a yearly visit which overjoyed his father, who saw in his rise the satisfaction of his most eager hopes.

Mrs. Jefferson had died in 1782, but Jefferson's daughter, Martha, Mrs. Thomas Mann Randolph, lived with him at Monticello, with her husband and family of eleven children, as did

also a great deal of the time Francis Eppes, the only son of Jefferson's daughter, Mary. Jefferson's sister, Mrs. Marks, also spent much time there. Mrs. Randolph was a tall, splendid figure of woman, who had inherited all her father's brightness and sweetness of temper. Always cheerful and smiling, even in the face of adversity, always busy, the sound of her low singing or humming—a habit shared by her father—made cheerful the whole house. "Her disposition seemed to have the sunshine of heaven in it. Nothing ever wearied her patience, or exhausted what was inexhaustible, her sweetness, her kindness, indulgence, and self-devotion." She was a woman of intellectual power, a gifted musician, and was possessed of poised dignity which lessened not at all her gracious bearing. John Randolph toasted her as "the noblest woman in Virginia."

Her husband, a man of delightful personality, a member of Congress, a colonel in the War of 1812, and twice governor of Virginia, was an amiable spendthrift. His death in 1828 is said to have been caused by an illness contracted from giving his coat during a violent storm to a poor person he met on the highway.

The Randolph children, five sons and six daughters, made of Monticello a place of wild hilarity. Their grandfather adored them and they were all enthusiastic over him. He spent much time teaching them, watching their games and spurring them on, and playing with them. When he moralized it was never in the form of preaching and he was always closely friendly. He was once caught by a visitor down on all fours with a child on his back. He smiled and said: "I will make no other apology than the good Henry the Fourth did, when he was caught by an ambassador playing horse and riding one of his children on his back, by asking, 'Are you a father? If you are, no other apology is necessary.'"

Upon retirement from office both men had to consider the fundamental question of making a living. Jefferson, as has been seen, was in deep financial distress which never greatly lightened and Adams had no means beyond his farm. But

he was in reality in better circumstances than Jefferson. From the beginning he worked actively on the farm and found in labor rest, enjoyment, and salve to his wounded spirit. For some years he was continuously active and even after he stopped physical labor, he supervised and directed the work, but an increasing part of his time was given to other occupations. He read omnivorously, wrote extensively, and more and more sought the companionship of friends and neighbors. In his habits of life he was regular and systematic. He ate with appetite until the end of his life but with moderation. In his early years he had suffered from indigestion and had found in corn-meal batter-bread an acceptable and healthful food. It was on his table three times every day and was the staple article of his diet. Cider had been prescribed for him and he drank a large mug of it before breakfast every day and, in these latter years, at other times as well. In his letters to Benjamin Waterhouse he extolled it and its use. It was better than Rhenish, Mozelle, Sherry or Madeira. None agreed with his health so well "as the cyder of New England." But, he added, "I seldom drink it under a year old, and often two and sometimes three." He would have been a proved hero in the hard cider campaign of 1840! He smoked a pipe in earlier years, but had given it up long before these later ones.

Jefferson's activities were quite different. He performed no physical labor in the fields himself, but he did for some years exercise a general supervision of the work on the farm and close oversight of that in the garden. He was not successful as a director of large operations, for while his theories were good, he could not put them into practice. But his gardens were highly successful. He was deeply devoted to flowers and was constantly securing seeds and plants from Philadelphia and from Europe. As soon as he reached Monticello he laid off the beds in the gardens and planted hyacinths and tulips in great quantities. During this first year he set out more than a thousand fruit trees. He kept a most complete gardening record in which he jotted down every detail of cultivation and planting—the first blooms of fruit and flowers, the

time of harvest, the first ripe fruit and every imaginable fact important or unimportant. He kept, too, a complete meteorological diary, examining and recording the thermometer as soon as he rose. He and Adams were both keenly sensitive to cold and luxuriated in warm weather.

Jefferson, like Adams, waked early and rose at once, saying just before his death that the sun had not caught him in bed in fifty years. In winter he made his own fire, and after dressing he wrote and read until an early breakfast, after which he went at once to the garden. When he came in, he wrote until one o'clock, when he mounted his horse and rode until dinner, which came at half past three. After dinner he wrote until a little before sunset when he came out and walked on the terrace or lawn, conversed with his family and friends, or watched the children at play. After supper he spent the evening with the family, having his own little table and candle, sometimes reading and sometimes joining in the conversation. He usually went to his room at nine and gave an hour to "some moral reading whereon to ruminate in the intervals of sleep." This routine of life, however, was often interrupted by the presence of guests.

He ate sparingly but with good appetite, confining himself almost entirely to vegetables and bread. He drank tea or coffee for breakfast and at other meals had always on his table "malt liquors" or cider. He drank regularly three glasses of wine each day and sometimes more, but cared only for light wine. Spirits of any sort he would not touch, refusing in his last illness to take the brandy prescribed, which might have prolonged his life. No man ever better exemplified true temperance.

He was a superb horseman and found in riding not only needed exercise but keen delight. He had when he returned to Monticello a superb horse, fittingly named Wildair, which he rode for a time. During the last few years of his life he rode a magnificent one named Eagle. He would have none that were not blooded and he required of his grooms such particular care that he could rub a cambric handkerchief on his horse's coat without soiling it.

Jefferson was very kindly and indulgent to his servants who were housed, clothed, and fed as well as white people. Punishment was rare, reliance for good behavior being placed in a system of rewards and distinctions which he established. He preferred selling one to allowing him to be whipped. His own personal attendant was Burwell, who idolized him and to whom Jefferson was deeply attached. During the last years of his master's life Burwell slept on a pallet in his room. He and several others of the servants were freed by Jefferson's will.

During the early years of retirement Jefferson busied himself with the invention of all sorts of devices, some highly useful and some impractical. He, rather than his New England crony, had the far-famed Yankee ingenuity, for Adams had no taste for this sort of thing and no aptitude for it. Jefferson, however, was handy with tools and in a small room adjoining his bedroom he had an assortment of them with which he worked constantly, repairing furniture and making new chairs, tables, bookcases, and the like. A folding chair, which could be made a walking-stick and which he carried about with him and used constantly, was one of his inventions. He is said to have been the inventor of the revolving desk chair. During the War of 1812 he invented an improved hemp-break. Long before this he had invented his famous and, agriculturally speaking, revolutionary plough, as well as many other things.

Both Adams and Jefferson were deeply religious, but both were for their time entirely unorthodox; Adams, perhaps, more so than Jefferson. Both attended church regularly. Adams in 1774 had chosen a pew in the Congregational Church in which he regularly worshipped, for which he had contributed the site, and under which he and John Quincy Adams were later buried. The committee in charge called his attention to a pillar which cut off his view of the pulpit. He replied, "Gentlemen, I thank you for your suggestion, but I remember that faith cometh by hearing." But regular as he was at church, he rejected Calvinism and became, as did Jefferson,

substantially a Unitarian. Jefferson regularly attended the Episcopal Church near Charlottesville, but he often went elsewhere and attended frequently the services of Baptists and Methodists, held in the courthouse.

To the two homes came many visitors and to both men they gave keen delight, for they were truly hospitable hosts and thoroughly social in their tastes. To Adams visitors were an increasing pleasure, but in the course of time they became a terrible financial burden to Jefferson. Not only were they more numerous, but when they came to see him, invited or uninvited, they put up at Monticello—there was nowhere else to stay. The nearness of Boston spared Adams this sort of thing. Jefferson sometimes had fifty people in his house for the night, while his stables were full of visiting horses. He must have been prepared to sympathize with Madison, who said he was delighted with the society of his guests but did not have the same feeling for their horses!

Many of these visitors were complete strangers and some of them undoubtedly came because of the free lodging and entertainment. At last Jefferson had to protect himself from intruders and declined to see some of those who called. Because of this, one disappointed and determined lady used her umbrella to break out a pane of glass in the dining-room window in order that she might have a view of the great man before she departed.

It was no wonder that they came to both homes. The atmosphere of each was of a sort to tempt them, and both hosts were a delight. Both were charming conversationalists, not only because of their essential wisdom and ripe experience but, in addition, because each had a rich fund of anecdote and reminiscence. Adams had also a keen and spicy wit which enlivened his table talk. Jefferson, less endowed with humor, was more serious. The Adams table was a place of banter and high good humor; that of Jefferson, while vivacious, was more sedate.

The friends varied widely in appearance in these years. Adams was of middle height, with a stout, well-knit frame.

As he grew old he became fat. His head was large and domed, and his face would have been stern except for blue eyes which were mild and which often twinkled with fun. He was careful but severely simple in his dress. His manner was grave and dignified, but he could and did unbend frequently. He was warmly affectionate, but undemonstrative, partly from a desire to hide his feelings. Truth and simplicity of mind were stamped upon him. He had a tendency towards intolerance which, however, steadily lessened in these years. He was not averse to flattery and fairly bloomed under sympathetic understanding and kindness.

Jefferson, on the other hand, was tall and thin and as age advanced he lost flesh. His figure, however, was good and "as straight as a gun barrel." His face was full of gentleness and tenderness, and his hazel eyes were those of a dreamer, student, and idealist. He was careless in dress, paying no attention to styles. Even more than Adams, he had escaped from the "tyrant fashion", though perhaps not so much from the "tyrant party." Late in life he cut off his queue for the sake of comfort, and about the same time and for the same reason he abandoned knee breeches and wore long, loose trousers.

In a day of profuse swearing neither employed oaths in conversation. In a day of open libertinism the morals of each were beyond reproach. Neither was given to over-indulgence in alcohol. Adams, apart from his hard cider, rarely, if ever, touched it. Jefferson was bitterly hostile to spirits of every kind and particularly to whiskey, which he said killed one-third of the citizens and ruined their families. Nevertheless he maintained a still on his plantation, making whiskey, however, in very limited quantity. He liked wine and believed in its use, both for health and because he thought it prevented the use of spirits. He was opposed to any tax on wine which he declared "a prohibition of its use to the middling class of our citizens, and a condemnation of them to the poison of whiskey which is desolating their houses. No nation is drunken where wine is cheap and none sober where the dearness of wine substitutes

ardent spirits as the common beverage. It is, in truth, the only antidote to the bane of whiskey."

Two more sober individuals could scarcely be found, but on August 6, 1826, the London *John Bull* announced their deaths in this fashion:

By a curious coincidence Adams and Jefferson, two of the revolted colonists who signed the Declaration of American Independence, died on the 4th of July, that being the fiftieth anniversary of rebellious triumph over the Mother Country. This coincidence is, however, rendered less curious by a statement which has reached us that these patriotic malcontents brought on their sympathetic deaths by the liberal potations in honor of their unnatural ingratitude.

Evidently the early nineteenth century possessed an Horatio Bottomley!

Age treated them kindly. By 1812 Adams had what he called a "quivering of the hands", but it did not seriously trouble him for a long time. His eyesight was poor and he had to be read to, but his hearing was unimpaired until a year and a half before his death. His memory and mind remained clear until the last. Both men were able to ride almost to the end, but while Adams could walk well for considerable distances, such exercise tired Jefferson long before his death. He, also, had full possession of his faculties to his death, although he sometimes complained of loss of memory. Neither paid much attention to doctors. Jefferson said, "It is not physic that I object to so much as physicians," and he added that whenever he saw three of them together he looked up to discover if there was not a turkey buzzard in the neighborhood. But in his last illness he called in one, chiefly for the comfort of his family, and because he was a close personal friend.

So through the years they spent happily, industriously, and usefully, the hours of each day. Both loved life, but neither feared death. As Adams said, they "had eat their cake." Neither, while comparatively poor, had any touch of avarice. Both had fiery tempers, Jefferson's being better restrained, but these years were not those of storm, but rather of peaceful Indian summer. Each looked back with joy upon life and was grateful, as Adams said, "to his Maker and Preserver."

And so, in the words of James Schouler, "hand in hand these gray-haired sires of '76 went down the declivity of life together, discoursing as they grew old of things past and to come, this world and the next; and through those dread gates which never swing backward they passed into a broad eternity lit as they vanished by rays of the same independence sun."

DOUBLE REPRESENTATION AND VOTE BY HEAD BEFORE THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

GEORGE GORDON ANDREWS

University of Iowa

ON August 8, 1788, the decree went forth which convoked the States General for May 1, 1789. This announcement, together with the request for information regarding previous convocations, brought the country up on tip-toe of excitement and expectation, although it was not until after the fall of Brienne that the promise was taken seriously. With the government definitely pledged to the meeting of this historic body, the battle was on between the privileged and the non-privileged classes of France. The rapidity with which the issue was joined is shown by the sudden change in attitude toward the *parlements*. For almost a century they had championed the cause of the people and been a bulwark against the despotism of Church and King. But when in September they unblushingly pronounced in favor of the organization of the forth-coming States General after the forms of 1614, that was too much. Their support vanished and their leadership came to a sudden end.

The reason for this change of attitude was that the declaration in favor of the forms of 1614 committed the *parlements* to oppose the double representation of the third estate and the meeting of the three orders in a single assembly with the vote *par tête* and majority rule. These provisions were, notwithstanding, an irreducible minimum if any changes were to be made in the government which would benefit the third estate.¹

¹ The operation of the vote *par ordre* seems to have been misunderstood by some historians who declare that the third estate feared it would always be outvoted by the other two. The Ordinance of Orléans, 1560, Art. 135, provided that in voting taxes either in the States General or in the provincial estates the agreement of each of the three orders was essential (Jourdan, Decrusy, Isambert, *Recueil général des anciennes lois Françaises*, XIV, 95), and this procedure was extended to practically all matters coming before the States General (Boullée, M.A. *Histoire complète des états-généraux*, II, 253). There were a few exceptions to this rule in the provincial estates but, so far as I know, the unanimity of the orders was required in the States General. According to d'Epremesnil, "L'opinion par Ordres, tellement indépendans les uns des autres, que deux n'obligent pas le troisieme, est la constitution."—*Réflexions d'un magistrat, sur la question du*

Their importance can hardly be exaggerated. They were the storm center of the early Revolution. The commons realized that to fail here was to lose all. In the famous *Résultat du conseil* of 27 December, 1788, the third estate was granted a representation equal to that of the two upper orders combined, but the question of the single assembly and the vote by head (without which double representation was a mockery) was only settled after a long and bitter struggle in the final union of the orders on June 27, 1789.

Considering their importance, we are naturally led to inquire where the ideas of double representation and vote by head originated. De Tocqueville has taught us to be wary in assuming that such democratic principles are attributable to spontaneous generation, springing fullgrown from the minds of revolutionary leaders, like Athena from the head of Zeus. One thing can be settled at the outset. The demand for increased representation of the third estate was by no means limited to asking merely for a number equal to that of the privileged orders combined. To Sièyes, double representation even with the vote by head was "monstrous", and he characterized the arrangement whereby the "will of two hundred thousand can balance that of twenty-five million" as "an assembly turned wrong side out".² In another contemporary pamphlet we read; "The nation being composed of about twenty-five million citizens, the proportion of representatives of the third estate on one hand, and of the clergy and nobility on the other should be twenty-four to one. This proportion is just and should be secured."³ Others, while pointing out the

nombre et celle de l'opinion par ordre ou par tête, 3. The *cahier* of the nobles of Carcassonne was even more explicit: "La France est une monarchie dont la constitution admet trois ordres distinctifs, et leur unanimité est indispensable pour exprimer le vœu national; le veto dévolu à chaque ordre garantissant à tous une égale influence, nul ne peut être opprimé par les deux autres réunis."—*Arch. Parl.* II, 527. See also *Arch. Parl.* III, 637, and *Instructions et cahier du Hameau de Madon*, 24, 25, by the bishop of Blois. The objection of the commons to this system, which viewed superficially appeared fair, was that it made inaction certain. On matters of disagreement, a deadlock was inevitable. This would mean the perpetuation of the old régime in the interest of the privileged classes. The commons wanted a change, and consequently demanded a system by which this change could be effected.

² *Qu'est-ce que le tiers-état?* (2nd. ed.) p. 109.

³ *Lettres d'un avocat à un publiciste*, seconde lettre, 24 Novembre, 1788, p. 6.

relative difference in numbers, did not demand that it be made the basis of representation. "There is a million of the clergy and nobility", said Target, "while there are more than twenty million in the third estate. I do not propose to hold to this proportion, but it is necessary that the nation have at least as much power as the privileged orders. . . . My own opinion is that the representation most just and proportional would be that which, out of five deputies, would give the clergy one, the nobility one, and the third estate three."⁴

It can hardly be denied that a much more logical case could be made for representation based upon population than for simply doubling the number of the commons. If it were once conceded that there was adequate reason for granting the privileged orders a representation out of proportion to their numbers, that very argument would be used as a justification for giving them a representation sufficient to make their influence in the government controlling. On the other hand, any argument which could be used effectively for giving the commons the least increase in representation would be still more potent for giving them a representation in accordance with their numbers. The difficulty of drawing a line would also be obviated if population were the basis.

Why, then, did not a larger proportion of the third estate give their vigorous support to this more logical demand? There are several factors to be considered in attempting to answer this question. Very little was known about the practical operation of democracy and even the liberals were unwilling to see such principles carried out consistently. This was clearly demonstrated in the action of the bourgeoisie. They were good democrats, indeed, when it was a matter of gaining political privileges for themselves, but once their own influence was secure, they were as set against any further extension of the system as the most hardened aristocrats. Democracy is seldom invoked where advantages are to be given rather than received, more surely if these advantages are at the expense of the giver. Again, such a measure would undoubtedly encounter strong and united opposition from the court, the gov-

⁴ *Les états-généraux convoqués par Louis XVI*, 61, 63.

ernment, and the aristocracy, and, considering the political weakness of the third estate, would have scant prospect of success. A moderate concession might be made, while extreme demands would in all likelihood be met with a peremptory refusal. If part of a loaf was preferable to the whole, of which inferior citizens would get the lion's share, it was even more preferable to none.

But the chief reason why a public sentiment in support of popular representation was lacking was that French history failed to reveal this principle in operation. There was no popular representation in former administrations, and existing institutions showed no evidence of its influence. Small wonder then that the demand was neither sufficiently widespread nor persistent to be conceded. In their search for a reform program, the French naturally fell back upon their experimental knowledge. The English are not the only people whose search for precedents, conscious or unconscious, has been successful, although some of theirs were later found to be largely a product of the imagination. The French also esteem practice above theory, and in so doing have shown themselves more evolutionary than revolutionary, political theorists and common belief to the contrary.

The difficulty with following the practices of the States General in former sessions was the fact that they had varied to a remarkable degree. Examples could be found of almost every kind of procedure, but the lack of continuity deprived all of them of the character of true precedents. In a pamphlet Target showed how the number of members varied in the respective meetings, how the number of deputies from the several provinces and orders changed without rule or reason, how the manner of voting had differed at different times and on different questions, and how the whole scheme seemed to have developed gradually in the most haphazard fashion.⁵ He then ridiculed the idea that any of these could be a part of an established constitutional system. There can be little doubt that his contention was generally sound.⁶

⁵ *Les états-généraux convoqués par Louis XVI*, passim. See also *Ile suite de l'écrit intitulé: Les états-généraux convoqués par Louis XVI*.

⁶ Boullée, *op. cit.*, II, 227-267.

It was not, however, in this general field that the precedents for double representation and vote by head were to be found, although isolated cases of their occurrence were cited and carried considerable weight in the discussion of the question. We must turn our attention to the field of local administration. In the provincial estates or assemblies these principles had been in operation for a sufficient time to show their desirability and to give sanction to their character as true precedents.⁷ Origins are difficult to trace. If the beginnings of the States General are to be found in the *Curia Regis*, then we must look for the beginnings of the provincial estates in the councils or courts of the great feudal lords.⁸ But for our purpose it is quite enough to go back to the admission of the third estate to these bodies. The rising wealth and influence of the bourgeoisie was largely responsible for the appearance of this class in the assemblies of both the nation and the provinces. The first known meetings of the three orders in provincial assemblies were in Languedoc in 1233 and 1254, antedating their meeting in the States General by over half a century and laying the foundation for it.⁹ It seemed to be a royal policy to call representatives from a limited district when a general assembly might be either dangerous or unnecessary. They were summoned for the purpose of securing financial aid and, as an anesthetic to reduce the pain of extraction, the representatives were allowed to present their grievances and desired reforms, in most cases with negligible results.¹⁰ More easily managed than a general assembly and

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 255.

⁸ Dareste de la Chavanne, *Histoire de l'administration en France*, I, 79; Laferrière, "Mémoire sur les états provinciaux" in *Mémoires de l'académie des sciences morales et politiques*, Paris, 1862, XI, 351; Dognon, *Les institutions politiques et administratives du pays de Languedoc*, 195, 196, 205. Cadier shows that the estates of Béarn and Bigorre developed from the feudal "cours plénières".—*Les états de Béarn*, 15-24.

⁹ Laferrière, *op. cit.*, 353-355. Similar meetings are mentioned for 1269, 1271, and 1274. See also Dognon, *op. cit.*, 197-199. Cadier, citing Pierre de Marca, *Histoire de Béarn*, I, IX, c. xxiii, pp. 833, 834 as authority, finds a meeting as early as 1212 at Pamiers, but he draws a sharp line between "les assemblées consultatives du XIIIe siècle et les assemblées délibératives du XIVe", considering only the latter worthy of the name of "états".—*Les états de Béarn*, 25, 26 and notes.

¹⁰ Luçay, *Les assemblées provinciales sous Louis XVI*, 3; Dareste de la Chavanne, *op. cit.*, I, 79, 80.

as a possible counterbalance against it, provincial assemblies found favor in the eyes of the government and were established throughout the entire country with considerable extension of powers.¹¹ They continued to play an important part in local administration down to the seventeenth century.

The independence of the local estates, although limited, and their lack of uniformity were bound to clash with the centralizing tendencies in evidence from the time of Louis XI. France had grown slowly and in a piece-meal fashion—a little here by inheritance or marriage, a little there by conquest, and a little yonder by negotiation and concession.¹² The master minds that were welding these heterogeneous fragments into a unified monarchy would have little patience with particularist institutions. The movement for the suppression of the provincial estates reached its climax with Richelieu and Mazarin. They found a ready pretext in the religious wars and the revolts of the nobles, while the indifference of the people in some cases and the weakness of the estates made their task comparatively easy.¹³ In the provinces thus deprived of their assemblies (*pays d'élection*) authority was henceforth centered in the hands of royal agents, the intendants.

Not all the local estates, however, were abolished. In some places the people clung to their assemblies with a tenacity that the government did not think wise to challenge. The provinces in which the estates survived (*pays d'états*) were, broadly speaking, those that had been added in later times and lay on the outskirts of the kingdom. The more important of these, maintaining their assemblies longest and in greatest vigor, were Languedoc, Burgundy, Brittany, Provence, Flanders, and Artois. Of the total population estimated by Necker in 1780 at 24,800,000, Luçay¹⁴ gives 7,100,000 to the *pays d'états*. Although successful in the struggle to retain their estates, they could not escape the centralizing movement. Dur-

¹¹ Laferrière, 355-360, 397-399; Boullée, II, 255, 256; Bavelier, *Essai historique sur le droit d'élection et sur les anciennes assemblées représentatives de la France*, 222; Léonce de Lavergne, *Les assemblées provinciales sous Louis XVI*, 33.

¹² Laferrière, 392.

¹³ Babeau, *La province sous l'ancien régime*, I, 21.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, 110. For Necker's figures see *Ibid.*, 25.

ing the seventeenth century they were shorn of a large part of their powers.¹⁵ The influence of the intendants became predominant, in spite of the fact that their hands were less free than in the *pays d'élection*.

In his attempt to consolidate and strengthen the monarchy, Richelieu recognized the independent power of the upper orders as the greatest obstacle. It was from this point of view that he regarded the provincial estates. They were mainly aristocratic in character due to the superior influence of the clergy and nobility in their origin and early development. The elective element was generally very small, and in this they differed radically from the Estates General, where the right to sit could only be had by election. Richelieu set about the solution of his problem with characteristic vigor. Where he was unable to suppress the assemblies and substitute royal elections, he made use of the rising power of the commons as a counter against the aristocracy.¹⁶ His treatment of the estates of Provence was indicative of his policy. Not only were the representatives of the upper orders reduced to a small proportion of the assembly, but the elective principle was applied to the few who were included, except in the case of the president.

Richelieu was also responsible for the change whereby the exclusive right to convoke the provincial estates was reserved to the king. Louis XIV, who inherited his policy, made use of this power to terminate the existence of the provincial assemblies in the center of France.¹⁷ The estates of Languedoc escaped inclusion in the heavy list of casualties only by the payment of a large sum. Even then they were forced to undergo a very considerable transformation. As reconstituted, they were composed of 23 bishops and 23 nobles sitting in full right for the upper orders, together with 68 members for the third estate.¹⁸ Representing the third estate were the mayors and consuls of the *villes*, and deputies of the twenty-

¹⁵ Laferrière, 395; Dareste de la Chavanne, I, 81.

¹⁶ For the work of Richelieu in suppressing the provincial estates or reducing their powers, see Laferrière, 399-410.

¹⁷ Laferrière, 410, 411.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 413-415.

three dioceses elected from the freeholders. The manner of voting was at first left to the discretion of the assembly, some votes being taken by head and others by order. Gradually, however, the vote by head in a single assembly won its way over the other method until in 1612 it was made the general rule, although the vote by order was not prohibited.¹⁹ This rule, continued in the reorganized assembly, gave to the third estate a majority over the other two orders combined, which constituted the distinctive characteristic of the estates of Languedoc.²⁰ Attempts were made later to do away with the assembly or reduce its influence, but by the most determined effort it was maintained in the exercise of its powers until the Revolution of 1789.

A striking example of the operation of the vote by head in an assembly where the third estate was not sufficiently numerous to outvote the privileged orders was furnished by the estates of Brittany. Every noble of the province had the right to a seat in the assembly. This gave the order a representation of 1,350 in 1789 as against 69 for the clergy and 48 for the third estate.²¹ While either method of voting was permissible, on all subjects of general interest to the province the nobility demanded the vote by head and through their numbers dominated the estates. The result was that Brittany remained a land of the feudal régime. With few exceptions, the other local assemblies existing until 1789 were similar in organization and operation either to those of Brittany or of Languedoc, and a comparison of these types proves all to the advantage of Languedoc.

By far the most important powers exercised by the provincial estates had to do with finance.²² Their control over the raising and disbursement of funds to be used for the province itself was practically complete.²³ They also voted

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 439, 440; Dognon (p. 266) dates the regular adoption of the vote by head much earlier—"à la fin du XVe siècle".

²⁰ De Tocqueville, *L'ancien régime et la révolution*, Paris, 1887, p. 326.

²¹ Laferrière, 452, 453.

²² Referring to Languedoc, Paul Viollet (*Histoire des institutions politiques et administratives de la France*, III, 245) makes this pointed comment: "c'est l'autonomie financière qui est inscrite au frontispice de l'histoire des états".

²³ Laferrière, 366.

the other taxes, but commissioners informed them as to what the king expected the province to contribute to the general government expense. While all the provinces alike were supposed to be subject to general taxes, the *pays d'états* possessed two highly prized and important advantages. In the first place, they provided an influential and responsible body which could bargain with the royal commissioners and which in some cases succeeded in getting the sum required of the province materially reduced. In 1735 Flanders obtained a reduction of 112,000 *livres* from the total of 262,000 demanded.²⁴ The estates of Artois drove a number of successful bargains,²⁵ one of the best being in 1662. The king demanded 600,000 *livres*: the estates offered 300,000; and they finally agreed on 400,000. Again, although they might be unable to secure any reduction in amount, they still had complete control of the apportionment and collection of the taxes. In a time when taxes were farmed out to greedy or hard pressed collectors who squeezed out the profits from the tight-fisted merchant or wrung the last *sou* from the unfortunate peasant, this was a gain which was not lightly to be cast aside. The estates of Languedoc apportioned both the general and the local taxes among the twenty-three dioceses of the province and either appointed the collectors or turned the collection over to the municipal officers according to the old Roman custom. In each diocese the division of the taxes among the *villes* and parishes was made by a committee presided over by a bishop and composed in addition of a noble, some deputies of the third estate, and a royal commissioner.²⁶

Besides their influence over finance, the provincial estates had other powers of considerable importance.²⁷ They could, by independent legislation or in agreement with royal agents, decide on such public works as monuments, roads, and canals

²⁴ Babeau, *op. cit.*, I, 76, note 4.

²⁵ Filon, *Histoire des états d'Artois*, 68, 71. In 1666 the intendant of Languedoc received the following notice from Colbert: "si vous trouvez trop de résistance à obtenir les 2 millions, elle [Sa Majesté] vous permet de vous relâcher à 1,800,000 *livres*".—Colbert, *Lettres*, IV, 43.

²⁶ Laferrière, 440, 441.

²⁷ For a list of these see *Ibid.*, 366-369.

within the province. The interests of religion and public education came under their supervision. The estates of Languedoc, Burgundy, and Brittany, together with the *parlements*, registered certain edicts and treaties emanating from the Crown when they involved the provincial administration. Some estates exercised or claimed the right to nominate deputies to the States General. All could present *cahiers* to the king, and provision was made for the execution of their decisions by intermediary commissions.

The centralization of the administration through the institution of intendants is usually regarded as a distinct benefit and in no sense incompatible with the successful operation of the local estates. The crucial defect of the old system was the separation of the provinces into *pays d'états* and *pays d'élection*, the latter having no adequate protection against the arbitrary action of unscrupulous and irresponsible officials. It was in the combination of the intendants representing the national authority and the provincial estates defending local interests that there was to be found, in the words of Laferrière, "les deux grands principes de l'ordre social, le pouvoir et la liberté".²⁸ The value of local estates was clearly evident and reformers, judging by the best results, uniformly selected the estates of Languedoc as the model to be followed in the general reorganization of the administration.

One of the earliest plans for this reorganization was advanced by Fénelon.²⁹ It bears the date of November, 1711. Conspicuous among its provisions is that which calls for the "establishment of special estates in all the provinces as in Languedoc". It also takes up the question of the States General and, evidently to reassure the government, explains that these assemblies of the entire realm "shall be peaceable and kindly as those of Languedoc, Brittany, Burgundy, Provence, Artois, etc." It does not call for the double representation of the commons in the States General. On the contrary, the representation from each diocese is given as the bishop, a

²⁸ *Op. cit.*, 432.

²⁹ The duc de Chevreuse co-operated in the formulation of this plan which was to be presented to the duc de Bourgogne. It is found in *Oeuvres de Fénelon*, Paris, 1824, XXII, 575-595.

member of the high nobility elected by the nobles, and a prominent member of the third estate elected by that body.

About the middle of the century another plan was published. It was the work of the Marquis de Mirabeau,³⁰ the father of the more famous Comte. Like Fénelon, he was most favorably impressed with the operation of the estates of Languedoc. Not satisfied with urging the formation of assemblies on this model in all the provinces without estates, he proceeded with definite specifications. The clergy and nobility were to be equally represented and the third estate was to have double the number of either. Their deliberations were to be in a common assembly where every deputy should have a vote and the majority should rule.

The publication of such plans and the continuous and successful operation of provincial assemblies where they still existed, all tended to bring the *pays d'états* into sharp contrast with the *pays d'élection*. The government could not be unmindful of this and in May, 1778, Necker addressed a memoir to the king advising the gradual creation of provincial or municipal administrations in the different *pays d'élection*.³¹ In harmony with this suggestion, a decree of the council under date of 12 July, 1778, provided for the establishment of an assembly in the province of Berri, which was to be composed of 12 members of the clergy, an equal number of nobles, and 24 members of the third estate. In this assembly, which was to meet every two years under the presidency of the archbishop of Bourges, it was stipulated that the vote should be taken by head and not by order.³² The double representation of the commons was not only carried out in the first three sessions of this body, but in the commission to verify proofs of nobility, in the composition of the different bureaux of the assembly, and in the membership of the intermediary commission the same proportion among the orders was maintained as far as

³⁰ *L'ami des hommes*, quatrième partie, "Précis de l'organisation ou mémoire sur les états provinciaux", 2nd. ed. 1758, vol. IV, especially pp. 257, 266, 277, 278.

³¹ "Mémoire au Roi sur l'établissement des administrations provinciales", in *Oeuvres complètes de M. Necker*, III, 333-367.

³² Jourdan, Decrusy, Isambert, *Recueil général des anciennes lois Françaises*, XXV, No. 908, pp. 354, 355.

possible. As for the vote by head, it was the rule not only in the provincial assembly itself, but even in the intermediary commission.³³

Decrees were passed for the establishment of similar assemblies in Dauphiné and in Montauban,³⁴ whose name was shortly changed to Haute-Guienne. Only in the latter case was an assembly actually set up, but it continued to function right up to the outbreak of the Revolution as did also that of Berri. These new creations appear to have operated quite successfully, for, in the spring of 1787, both sent representatives to the first council of notables, where they spoke in favor of the institution of provincial assemblies.³⁵ The council of notables not only approved of provincial assemblies but made some recommendations regarding them which should not be overlooked.

"Since one and the same interest should animate the three orders, it is believed that each should have an equal number of representatives. The first two have preferred to be merged and combined; and because of this the third estate, assured of having as many votes as the clergy and nobility together, will never fear that any special interest might draw away its votes. Moreover, it is just that this group of his Majesty's subjects, so numerous, so worthy of his interest and protection, should receive, in number of votes at least, an influence equal to that which wealth, honors, and birth necessarily give.

"In accordance with these views, the king will command that the votes be received not by order, but by head. The majority vote by orders does not always represent this real majority, which alone expresses truly the will of an assembly."³⁶

In June of the same year the edict was issued granting provincial assemblies to all provinces of the realm without estates. It followed in all essential points the lines laid down in the assemblies of Berri and Haute-Guienne. The king gave

³³ *Procès-verbal des séances de l'assemblée provinciale du Berri*, Bourges, 1781.

³⁴ *Oeuvres complètes de M. Necker*, III, 390-393.

³⁵ Léonce de Lavergne, *op. cit.*, 66, 99.

³⁶ *Procès-verbal de l'assemblée de notables*, tenue à Versailles en l'année 1787 Paris, 1788, p. 247.

as his reasons for extending the system the good results produced in these two provinces, and the "unanimous resolutions of the notables whom we have summoned".³⁷ The outbreak of the Revolution prevented this edict from being carried into effect, but it shows quite clearly the intention of the government.

The climax of the movement for double representation and vote by head before the Revolution was reached in the remarkable series of events that took place in Dauphiné in 1788. That province had retained its estates at the time of its union with France,³⁸ but they had been suspended in 1628. This sacrifice was accompanied by a widespread feeling of grievance, and there had always lingered in the province a sincere attachment to the ancient estates, no doubt somewhat exaggerated by the common tendency to idealize that which has passed away. A crisis was precipitated when the government attempted to set up a provincial assembly. The *parlement* at Grenoble saw fit to append several important reservations to the registration of the act, and, in the altercation which followed, finally demanded the convocation of the ancient estates of the province.³⁹ Although the assembly offered by the government was an improvement over the old estates with their out-grown machinery and inequalities, it was unacceptable by reason of its origin. Resistance continuing, Brienne determined to rid the government once for all of these troublesome *parlements* by shearing them of their powers. The edicts which transferred the right of registration to a *cour plénière* were published at Grenoble on May 10, 1788, and their registration enforced with the greatest military precautions.⁴⁰

This action united all classes of the province in opposition and produced a veritable insurrection against the government, a detailed discussion of which cannot be undertaken here. Meetings of protest were held and when troops were employ-

³⁷ Jourdan, Decrusy, Isambert, *Recueil général des anciennes lois Françaises*, XXVIII, No. 2350, pp. 364, 365.

³⁸ Léonce de Lavergne, 372, 373.

³⁹ Ch. Bellet, *Les événements de 1788 en Dauphiné*, 13-25.

⁴⁰ "Rapport au Roi" in Champollion-Figeac, *Chroniques Dauphinoises*, I, 333-335; Chérest, *La chute de l'ancien régime*, II, 5.

ed, the people went to the extremity of meeting force with force.⁴¹ The affair culminated in a proposed assembly of the three orders of the province, which was announced to take place in Grenoble on July 21. Brienne, deciding to prevent this meeting, replaced the too sympathetic governor, the duc de Clermont-Tonnerre, by the more vigorous marshall de Vaux and at the same time increased the number of troops under his command. But the new governor soon recognized that the movement was beyond control. He therefore presented a compromise offering to permit the assembly and even to protect it, provided it was not held in Grenoble. His conditions were accepted and a place of meeting was found eight or ten miles distant at Vizille, a chateau which was placed at their disposal by its owner, Claude Perier, a rich manufacturer and father of the celebrated minister, Casimir Perier.⁴²

The meeting was held at Vizille as appointed. In a long session of almost eighteen hours, broken by only one intermission, a series of resolutions was framed. Among other things, the king was entreated to withdraw the obnoxious edicts, to convoke the States General of the realm and also the estates of the province. A change was demanded, however, in the composition of the estates of the province—"the deputies of the third estate shall be equal to those of the first two orders combined," and "all the places there shall be elective". These resolutions were introduced in an assembly where the vote was taken by head, and with one unimportant exception they were passed unanimously.⁴³ It seems quite impossible to determine the exact number in attendance or the proportion among the orders.⁴⁴ It is clear, however, that each order had

⁴¹ Ch. Dufayard, "La journée des tuiles" in *Revue Historique*, XXXVIII, 305-345; Augustin Perier, *Histoire abrégée du Dauphiné*, 55-58.

⁴² Taulier, *Histoire du Dauphiné*, 293.

⁴³ *Procès-verbal de l'assemblée des trois ordres de la province de Dauphiné à Vizille*.

⁴⁴ In the *Procès-verbal*, the number of deputies of the clergy is given as 49, of the nobility as 233, and of the third estate as 391, making a total of 673. The *Procès-verbal* in Champollion-Figeac, *Chroniques Dauphinoises*, I, 438-448, lists the names of the deputies and gives 50 for the clergy, 226 for the nobility, and 187 for the third estate: a total of 463. Bellet, *op. cit.*, 38-40, places the total at 502 of whom the clergy had 50, the nobles 165, and the third estate 287. He claims that the actual number of voters from the third estate was reduced to

a substantial representation, and the unanimity with which the above resolutions were passed makes the exact proportion of secondary importance. This self-appointed assembly announced another session for the first of the following September.

The government was not yet willing to let affairs in Dauphiné take their course. It determined to authorize an assembly itself which would make the illegal meeting already scheduled for September 1, both unnecessary and useless. To this end, "the 29th of the present month he [the king] will hold in the town of Romans an assembly composed of 30 members of the order of the clergy, 60 of the order of the nobility, and 90 of the order of the third estate; which assembly is authorized by his majesty to deliberate and declare its will on the manner most useful to the province of convoking its estates and on the form which should be given to their composition, without it being allowable for the said assembly to take up any other matters for which it is not convoked and which should be referred to the assembly of the provincial estates itself".⁴⁵ The opposition in the province stiffened with the publication of this decree and it was only with the fall of Brienne and the recall of Necker to the ministry that a compromise was reached. Necker agreed to authorize the meeting of the three orders which had been adjourned from Vizille, provided the assembly would convene at Romans and restrict its deliberations to a plan for the provincial estates, which plan, he assured them, the government would be happy to sanction.⁴⁶ In spite of considerable resistance on the part of the more independent patriots, this compromise arrangement was finally worked out.

The five days previous to the first general session at Romans on September 10, were occupied in the verification of

110. J. A. Félix Faure, *Les assemblées de Vizille et de Romans en Dauphiné durant l'année 1788*, 162, says there were 540 deputies of whom 50 were ecclesiastics, 165 nobles, and 325 of the third estate. He adds that 61 nobles sent their proxies to their colleagues, so the nobility had an actual representation of 226.

⁴⁵ Art. 1, "Arrêté du conseil d'état du 2 aout 1788", in Champollion-Figeac, *Chroniques Dauphinoises*, II, 10-13.

⁴⁶ Chérest, *op. cit.*, II, 376, 377.

credentials and the settlement of the proportion among the orders. According to the official record⁴⁷ which lists the names of the deputies, there were 48 ecclesiastics, 190 nobles with 122 substitutes, and 423 members of the third estate in attendance, making a total of 783. With the clergy so hopelessly outnumbered, an adjustment was undertaken by the nobles. First fixing the number of their own voting deputies at 190, they granted each ecclesiastic two votes until their total reached 95. This arrangement being accepted by the clergy, the commons approved and at the same time reduced their total vote to 285, a number equal to the combined vote of the two upper orders. The same proportion between the third estate and the privileged orders was maintained in the selection of thirty-six commissioners to distribute the work of the assembly. It was also decided that the vote should be by head.

When such scrupulous care was taken in this body to preserve the equilibrium among the orders, similar provisions in their plan occasioned no surprise. The first article of the proposed plan reads: "The estates of Dauphiné shall be formed of one hundred forty-four representatives or deputies of the three orders of the province: i.e. twenty-four members of the clergy, forty-eight of the nobility, and seventy-two of the third estate". In the intermediary commission, which was to act when the estates were not in session, and in the estates themselves action could only be taken in a meeting where the three orders were assembled together.⁴⁸

The plan also provided a method for the selection of representatives to the recently announced meeting of the States General. "The clergy, nobles, and commons shall assemble in order to name, according to the forms and qualifications already described, a number of representatives equal to that of the members of the estates; these new representatives shall unite with the estates to elect by ballot those who shall be sent to the States General; they shall be chosen as the electors

⁴⁷ *Procès-verbal de l'assemblée générale des trois ordres de la province de Dauphiné, tenue à Romans.*

⁴⁸ The entire plan is made up of 60 articles and is found in the *Procès-verbal*, 132-154.

prefer, either from the members of the estates or from other citizens, provided both are property owners and residents of the province, without distinction of place and district; a number of representatives of the third estate shall be deputed equal to the number of those of the first and second orders combined".

In general the plan for the provincial estates was approved by the king,⁴⁰ but the article providing for the selection of representatives to the States General just quoted above was omitted. To explain the omission it was stated that "his majesty reserves the right to make known his intentions in this matter in the plan which he will issue for the convocation of the States General, after having heard the decision which will be presented to him by the Notables of his realm".⁴⁰ This shows that the government was not yet prepared to take the step which was published in the *Résultat du conseil* of 27 December. The three orders of Dauphiné, however, persisted in their resolutions, and, following the suggestion of one of the royal commissioners, prepared a letter to the king in which certain principles regarding the organization of the States General were laid down.⁴¹ "These principles are the free election of representatives. A greater number of them than at any of the preceding States Generals. Equality of numbers between the deputies of the first two orders combined and those of the commons. All deliberations carried on by the three orders united and the votes counted by head." Since the commons formed the largest part of the population and paid the most taxes, they deserved double representation, and the clergy and nobles of Dauphiné requested that it be granted as an act of justice. It was asserted that "this equality of numbers would be useless if each order deliberated separately", and the king was besought to pronounce against such a calamity.

⁴⁰ The government's plan consisting of 61 articles forms the principal part of the "Arrêt du conseil d'état du roi" in *Procès-verbaux des assemblées générales des trois ordres et des états provinciaux du Dauphiné tenus à Romans en 1788*. Réimprimés à l'occasion du centenaire de la révolution française avec une introduction par André Lebon. (Certified copy). Lyon, 1888. Pp. 124-141.

⁴¹ *Procès-verbaux*, 157, 158.

⁴² For the complete letter which was approved by the assembly Nov. 8, see *Procès-verbaux*, 169-176.

Preparations were begun early in November for the meeting of the provincial estates which was set for December 1, at Romans, and it was not until January 16, 1789, that the session closed.⁵² The concession was at last wrung from Necker to permit the election of the one hundred forty-four members to act with the estates in selecting the representatives to the States General. It was on New Year's Day that the balloting began for the election of these deputies. They were the first elections in France and took place without official authorization, which was not issued until January 24. The instructions drawn up for the guidance of the representatives of the province are very important.⁵³ Powers were conferred on the persons properly chosen for the States General so long as that body "shall be composed of members freely elected". The deputies were to use all their powers to secure double representation for the third estate (although this was 31 December, they evidently had not yet learned that the king had granted this on the 27th) and a single assembly where the votes would be counted by head. They were not to vote upon any proposition before these measures were definitely decreed, and in case they did, they were to be disavowed by the assembly and their powers revoked.

Dauphiné made known its desires in no uncertain terms, but it spoke even more effectively by example than by precept. In the assemblies at Romans the different orders worked together with exemplary good will, carrying out in practice the principles which they demanded the government to observe in the formation of the States General. The effect upon the rest of France was profound. Aulard says: "Immediately France turned her attention toward Dauphiné. . . . From all parts of the realm they wrote . . . for advice, instruction, and guidance. It could have been said that Dauphiné ruled all France".⁵⁴ Although delayed by the opposition of a

⁵² *Procès-verbaux*, 185-336. These pages are a reprint of the complete *Procès-verbal* of this session.

⁵³ *Procès-verbaux*, 275-277. These instructions were drafted before the members were elected.

⁵⁴ *Les orateurs de l'assemblée constituante*, 353.

reactionary court which dominated the government, her example was ultimately followed.

It is not to be understood that double representation and vote by head were adopted in 1789 merely because they were well known practices and had been in operation for generations. They were the *sine qua non* to bring about the political transformation demanded by the third estate. They thus involved that happy combination of the old and the new essential to the success of any progressive movement—enough of the old to reduce prejudice and disarm the charge of radical innovation, and enough of the new to make possible the desired changes in the established order.

THE LIBRARIAN AND THE NOVELIST

CHARLES H. COMPTON

St. Louis Public Library

THIS is addressed to all writers of modern fiction. Why can you not occasionally make use of a librarian for a heroine? Why is it necessary for you continually to employ teachers, secretaries, artists—always artists—great singers, shop girls, and the idle rich? Do you not know that the humblest library assistant is an under-paid, active promoter of your wares? Something is due her. Here is an opportunity for an aspiring writer, for no one has, as yet, done justice in fiction to the present day librarian. She has attractive possibilities, as I hope to demonstrate.

A few modern writers have taken librarians as main or minor characters, but they have usually failed in depicting them as typical librarians. Perhaps there is no such individual as a typical librarian, but there are, I think, traits which are pretty common among librarians. Here are some of their traits as I see them after the associations of some years. Librarians are rank individualists, optimists in practice though most of them would not admit that they are; true Simians, bookish, if only superficially. Fifty per cent have a sense of humor (my estimate), are enthusiastic in their work, tolerant of ideas but not of people, especially not of other librarians, generally not sentimental, sufficiently wicked to be interesting. In elaborating on their traits it is interesting to see how modern novelists have treated librarians as characters. The books to which reference will be made are *The Breadwinners* by John Hay, *Summer* by Edith Wharton, *Moon-Calf* by Floyd Dell, *The Rose-Garden Husband* by Margaret Widdemer, *The Cathedral* by Hugh Walpole, *Martie*, *The Unconquered* by Kathleen Norris, and *Main Street* by Sinclair Lewis.

First we shall take Charity Royall in *Summer*, the librarian of a small New England library. She is young, pretty, ignorant, and crude. She sits crocheting in a library where no new books have been purchased for twenty years. Her

salary is eight dollars a month. A few extracts from the book will set her out.

Today the sense of well-being was intensified by her joy at escaping from the library. She liked well enough to have a friend drop in and talk to her when she was on duty but she hated to be bothered about books.

A complaint was made because she often closed the library before the regular time to do so.

"See here," he said, "why ain't you at the library the days you're supposed to be there?"

"Who says I ain't?"

"There's been some complaints made, it appears."

Charity's smouldering resentment broke into a blaze. "I know! Orma Fry, and that toad of a Targatt girl—and Ben Fry, like as not. He's going around with her. The low-down sneaks—I always knew they'd try to have me out. As if anybody ever came to the library, anyhow."

Charity was not discharged, although the president of the library board threatened to do so and to replace her with a trained librarian. Perish the thought—a trained librarian at eight dollars a month! Charity's career as a librarian, however, is short, as she soon marries.

The most prominent trait in Miss Royall as a librarian was her lack of interest in her work. Perhaps the most prominent trait in librarians generally is their enthusiasm for their work. This enthusiasm, however, is not as broad as it might be. It is in many cases limited pretty closely to their own particular library or their own particular work. A librarian is usually as proud of her library and as loyal to it as Babbitt was to Zenith City. Librarians like to visit other libraries to get new ideas, as they say. However, I have observed that the visiting librarian often takes up most of the time telling how things are done in her own library. When it comes to getting ideas the librarian who stays at home is usually in the advantageous position.

Maud Matchin, in *The Breadwinners*, an assistant in an Ohio library, is as little fitted for a library position as Charity Royall, and in addition she is wholly mercenary. An interest-

ing portraiture is that of the president of the library board, Mr. Arthur Farnham, who recommends Maud's appointment to the other members of the board, although he is a man of thorough culture and refinement, not unlike John Hay in character. Let them introduce themselves.

She plucked up her courage and said: "My name is Miss Maud Matchin."

Farnham bowed, and rejoined: "My name is—"

She laughed outright, and said: "I know well enough what your name is, or why should I have come here? Everybody knows the elegant Mr. Farnham."

He made no reply to her compliment, but looked steadily at her, waiting to hear what she wanted and thinking it was a pity she was so vulgar, for she looked like the huntress Diana. . . .

"I am a graduate of the high school. I write a good hand but I don't like figures well enough to clerk."

* * * *

"You are . . . president of the library board ain't you?" asked the high school graduate, "I think I would like to be one of the librarians."

"Why would you like that?"

"Oh, the work is light, I suppose, and you see people, and get plenty of time for reading, and the pay is better than I could get at anything else. The fact is," she began to gain confidence as she talked, "I don't want to go on in the old humdrum way forever, doing housework and sewing, and never getting a chance at anything better. I have enough to eat and to wear at home, but the soul has some claims too, and I long for the contact of higher natures than those by whom I am now surrounded. I want opportunities for self culture, for intercourse with kindred spirits, for the attainment of a higher destiny."

"I do not know that there is a vacancy in the library."

"Oh, yes there is," she rejoined briskly; "I have been to see the librarian himself, and I flatter myself I made a favorable impression. In fact, the old gentleman seemed really smitten."

This is pretty bad, but it is not the worst. However, Maud's reasons for wishing to get a position in the library are similar to those of many young women. Library work is looked upon as nice, easy, clean work, elevating and highly respectable, with little thought of the qualifications needed for entering it.

Maud has a checkered career in her love affairs. She was at the point of eloping with Offitt, a scoundrel who attempted to murder Farnham for his money, when she was rescued by

faithful Sam who killed Offitt because he had attempted to lay his crime on him. Sam was acquitted on grounds of temporary insanity and Maud immediately married him and was lost to the library profession.

Maud Matchin, even as a character in fiction, stands out as exceptionally mercenary and vulgar. Librarians are neither. Until recently it has hardly been considered in accord with their professional ethics to discuss among themselves the need for higher salaries, and there has been little if any agitation for increases in salary standards, although they are lower to a marked degree than those of teachers, who have been active in their demands for higher compensation. There have been only one or two feeble attempts to unionize library workers. In an article in a recent magazine this lack of aggressiveness is laid to an innate gentleness common among librarians. My experience with them, however, would not lead me to believe that there is any immediate prospect of librarians inheriting the earth. They do not, as a rule, hesitate to make strenuous efforts to increase the incomes of their libraries, and as heads of departments or in less important positions they certainly could not be charged with being afraid to stand up for their rights or otherwise assert themselves. There are not many other cheeks turned by librarians. They are critical of each other. One library vies with another in the race for circulation and for supremacy in other statistics which none but librarians ever read. In a large public library divided into departments, the head of each department and every assistant in a department is inclined to hold with firm conviction to the idea that her department is the most important and the hardest worked of all. It is very much a matter of chance as to what line of work new recruits are assigned upon graduating from library school, but after they have gone into one line of work they soon come to look askance at other branches of the work. I am reminded of an assistant who at one time came to me with a request for a transfer to another department. She stipulated that she did not want evening work. The cataloguing department was about the only one where this stipulation

could be met, but when I suggested the possibility of transferring her there she looked greatly disturbed and said, "Oh, not that." I had, in fact, hesitated about making the suggestion, for I had doubts as to her ability to become a cataloguer. Assistants who work directly with the public, and cataloguers and other assistants who do not, naturally range themselves in opposing camps. The cataloguer is looked upon as being all bound round with red tape and the desk assistant, on the other hand, as a mere charger and discharger of books. There is, too, a pretty common feeling among those working with the adult public that children's library work has been badly sentimentalized and that children in the library are coddled with the story hour and in other ways. When an assistant in an adult department is transferred to the children's department, I have observed that this attitude usually soon changes.

Martie Monroe, our next heroine, was urged by Miss Fanny Breck, the head librarian in a community in California, to accept a position in the library. This is the conversation between them!

"Listen. Why don't you study the Cutter system, and familiarize yourself a little with this work, and come in here with me?" asked Miss Fanny in her firm, pushing voice.

"When?" Martie asked, considering.

"Well—I can't say when. I'm no oracle, my dear. But some day the grave and reverend seigneurs on my Board may give me an assistant, I suppose."

"Oh—I know—" Martie was vague again. "What would I get?"

Miss Fanny's harsh cheeks and jaw stiffened, her eyes half closed, as she bit her lip in thought.

"Fifteen, perhaps," she submitted.

Martie dallied with the pleasing thought of having fifteen dollars of her own each month.

"But can't Miss Fanny make you feel as if you were back in school?" she asked, when the girls were again in Main Street. "I'd just as lieves be in the lib'ary as anywheres," she added.

"I drather be in the box factory," Grace said, "More money."

"More work, too!" Martie suggested.

Martie did not take up library work as a vocation at this time nor did she go into the box factory, but instead she married an actor and was disowned by her father for doing it. She moved to New York where her husband, after sadly neg-

lecting her, finally deserted her. He returned within a few years to die. She then with her small son went back to California, having been forgiven by her father. Miss Fanny was as eager as ever to have her as an assistant, still I presume at the magnificent salary of fifteen dollars a month. Here is the lovely picture the author gives of her in the library:

In the pleasant summer mornings Martie walked down town with her father, as she had since she came home. But she left him at the big brick doorway of the library now, and by the time the fogs had risen from Main Street, she was tied in her silicia apron and happily absorbed in her work. She and Miss Fanny tiptoed about the wide cool spaces of the airy rooms, whispering, conferring.

She was expanding like a flower in sunlight. Her work interested her, she liked to pick books for boys and girls, old women and children. She liked moving about in a business-like way—not a casual caller, but a part of the institution.

Her duties were simple. She mastered them, to Miss Fanny's amazement, on the very first day and in a week she felt herself happily at home.

What a great pity that anyone who could master the intricacies of librarianship in only one day could not be retained! Alas for the profession, a banker soon proposed. As the wedding day drew near, a soul mate in the person of an author Martie had know in New York and who had recently been divorced, appeared on the scene. He also proposed. Martie was greatly affected. She dropped both her lovers and went to New York where she soon secured an important position on the staff of one of the popular magazines. She was described by the editor in this way:

"She's a corker. She's pretty and she talks fast and she's full of fun; but it's not that. She's got a sort of push to her."

As she entered upon her new career she pondered upon the past and the future:

"Love and wifehood and motherhood she had known, now she would know the joy of perfected expression, the fulfillment of the height."

Undoubtedly Martie was out of her sphere in the library. It is not the best place for scaling the heights in perfect soul fulfillment.

Phyllis Braithwaite of the *Rose-Garden Husband* is a children's librarian in a smutty city library, as the author calls it. Mrs. Widdemer, who was at one time a librarian, gives a rather dismal picture of the life Phyllis lives in the library.

Before that she had been in the Cataloguing, where your eyes hurt and you get a little pain between your shoulders, but you sit down and can talk to other girls; and before that in the Circulation, where it hurts your feet and you get ink on your fingers, but you see lots of funny things happening. She had started at eighteen years old, at thirty dollars a month. Now she was twenty-five, and she got all of fifty dollars, so she ought to have been a very happy Liberry Teacher indeed, and generally she was. . . . But at four o'clock of a wet Saturday afternoon, in a badly ventilated, badly lighted room full of damp little unwashed foreign children, even the most sunny-hearted Liberry Teacher may be excused for having thoughts that are a little tired and cross and restless.

It was after one of these Saturday afternoons that she had the following rebellious thoughts:

"I'm sick of elevating the public! . . . I'm sick of libraries, and of being efficient. I want to be a real girl! Oh, I wish—I wish I had a lot of money, and a rose garden and a husband!"

She had not recovered from this state of mind when an escape from the library was opened up to her. It came through the De Guenthers, people of position in the city who had a liking for entertaining lonesome librarians in their beautiful home and had been kind to Miss Braithwaite. They were commissioned to find a suitable young woman to become responsible for the care of a young man, who was paralyzed and had deep melancholia. He had been a brilliant fellow with great promise, but several years before this had been in an automobile accident with the girl he was soon to marry. She was killed and he had continued in this apparently hopeless condition since then. His mother, a wealthy woman, was at the point of death and there was no one else who could be depended upon to take care of the son. He could not live more than five years at the most, his doctors said. Miss Braithwaite is offered a home and wealth if she will marry the invalid and take care of him while he lives. Without much ado she accepts.

I beg of writers to make librarians anything but so sweetly, incredibly sentimental. There are only two kinds of women who could really do a thing like this, either a cold, mercenary individual without a trace of fineness, or a silly sentimental one without a drop of sense. We are obliged to place Miss Braithwaite in the latter class. Truly she is a wonderful woman, that the author makes out of this ex-children's librarian in her new role of wife to the invalid man. Phyllis calls heavily upon her library experiences in caring for her prostrate knight in his blank despair. As David with his harp charmed Saul, so she with her story telling art acquired in library days brought Allen out from his darkest moods. Phyllis had initiative, a desideratum for every librarian. Although she had never received more than her fifty dollars a month, she did not falter in buying a country house and other things due to a woman in her position. She was always cheerful and ever so tactful. She persuades Allan to try massage, though he has previously steadfastly refused. I suppose she got a book on massage from the library. The author truly gave her many of the qualities which one learns in library school and are necessary for a successful career in the library world.

A librarian as the villain of a story and a despicable villian, this is Miss Milton in *The Cathedral*. She was in the habit of setting aside new books for certain of her favorites and of telling others that the books were out. She was detected and discharged. Later there came into her hands a compromising letter affecting the man who had been instrumental in her losing her position. She uses the letter to get revenge. Let the author describe her:

Miss Milton sat, wrapped, in the warmest weather, in a thick shawl and knitting endless stockings (the out-of-date librarians are always represented as knitting or crocheting). She hated children. . . . She was also a Snob of the Snobs.

She saw the softest, easiest, idlest job in the world slipping out of her fingers.

She presented a strange and unpoetic appearance, huddled up in her wooden arm-chair, one fat leg crooked under her, her head sinking into her ample bosom, her whole figure shaking with convulsive grief, the chair creaking sympathetically with her. . . .

"I am dismissed! I am dismissed!" cried Miss Milton. "I leave here on Saturday. I have been librarian to this library, Canon Ronder, for more than twenty years. Yes, twenty years. And now I am dismissed like a dog with a month's notice."

She was incompetent, utterly incompetent. . . . She was a muddle headed, ill educated, careless, conceited and self opinionated woman.

This is rather harsh on librarians, if Miss Milton were to be considered typical. Perhaps there are a few Miss Miltons still remaining in the profession and this picture of them may not be far from the truth. It is an amazing thing, however, that when a Miss Milton does lose her position, generally there are some well meaning, tender hearted, often influential people who take up her cause and make it their business blatantly to try to get her re-instated. These same people not uncommonly are those who are loudest in their demands for efficiency in public affairs.

Helen Raymond in *Moon-Calf* is a different sort. It is in a highly complimentary manner that the author, in the words of his hero, describes her:

To him she was not so much the librarian, as the spirit half familiar and half divine which haunted this place of books. She had like these books a spirit above the rush and stir of common life. Something in her light step, her serene glances, personified for him the spirit of literature; she was its spirit made visible in radiant cold flesh.

More lately he had noted her quick whimsical smile and heard her soft impetuous speech. But he had never thought of her as quite belonging to the world of reality.

What a beautiful ethereal creature is this librarian, and it is a picture by one of our modern realists. It is flattering, but I fear that the author has somewhat idealized Helen Raymond. He cannot be fully aware of the things in a librarian's life which tend to disturb that divine serenity, such things as irate tax payers who object to paying fines for over due books, or Mrs. Grundys who are scandalized at the lax literature which the library allows on its shelves, or the gangs of boys who raid the library at night time and, when they have been driven from within, continue their depredations on the outside.

Perhaps the author has made Miss Raymond more bookish and intellectual than a real librarian is, though reading is, in

fact, likely to be her chief recreation. Bookish people, even if superficially so, naturally are attracted to library work, and books in a wide variety are always conveniently at hand for librarians. Then, too, reading is a recreation which makes slight demands on a slender purse.

Our next librarian in fiction, like Babe Ruth or the President, needs no introduction to the American Public. Carol Kennicott, before she went to Gopher Prairie, was a librarian for three years.

It was the advice of the professor of English literature which led her to study professional library-work in a Chicago school. Her imagination carved and colored the new plan. She saw herself persuading children to read charming fairy tales, helping young men to find books on mechanics, being so courteous to old men who were hunting for newspapers—the light of the library, an authority on books, invited to dinners with poets and explorers, reading a paper to an association of distinguished scholars.

After completing library school she entered the St. Paul Public Library.

Carol was not unhappy and she was not exhilarated in the St. Paul Library. She slowly confessed that she was not visibly affecting lives. She did, at first, put into her contact with the patrons a willingness which would have moved worlds. But so few of these stolid worlds wanted to be moved. When she was in charge of the magazine room the readers did not ask for elevated essays. They grunted, "Wanta find the Leather Goods Gazette for last February." When she was giving out books the principal query was, "Can you tell me of a good exciting love story to read? My husband's going away for a week."

She took walks and was sensible about her shoes and diet, and never did she think she was living.

It is not difficult to see why Sinclair Lewis chose a librarian out of which to make a Carol Kennicott. It is so easy for anyone like Carol, subject to moods of exaltation for social uplift, to dream dreams and sentimentalize over librarianship as a vocation. Naturally she was disappointed in it. There are among librarians some Carol Kennicotts. They are emotional, shallow, restless, and ineffectual. They make desperate efforts to get at the bottom of things and never make a beginning. Fortunately, however, for the profession most of them, like Carol, sooner or later get married.

Librarians as a whole object greatly to being classed as welfare workers. At a recent meeting of the American Library Association one of the speakers, a woman of wit and an able librarian, told of the need for more librarians in the South, where she was from. She emphasized this need vigorously, but added that those imbued with the missionary spirit were not wanted. This brought immediate response from the audience. It did not mean that these librarians were not devoted to their work or did not realize its importance, but they shrank from anything which smacked of condescension. I trust, too, that there is a sufficient sense of humor among them to enable them to realize that it does not devolve upon librarians to right all the ills of mankind.

There are a few more traits which should be mentioned as characterizing librarians. First, they are true Simians filled with "satiableness of curiosity." To prove this conclusively all librarians should read *This Simian World*. A brief quotation will perhaps be sufficient to see whether they recognize themselves. "If this hunger for books ever seems indiscriminate to them, when they themselves stop to examine it, they will have their excuses. They will argue that some bits of knowledge had later on come in most handy, in unthought of ways. . . . They will simply be like obstinate house keepers who clog up their houses, preserving odd boxes and wrappings, and stray lengths of string, to exult if one is of some trifling use ere they die."

Certainly many librarians act on this principle in acquiring material for their libraries. As regards books, they choose with sufficient discrimination, being limited for funds, but as regards pamphlets, documents, reports, catalogues, advertisements, time tables, an indiscriminate mass of materials is solicited, principally, as it would seem, because it is free. To many a librarian the question of throwing away the report of the Mayor of Walla Walla for 1903 would require as much serious consideration as to decide to get married or even to commit suicide. It simply is not done. Anyone who is contemplating marrying a librarian, especially a reference libra-

rian, is herewith warned that before doing so there ought to be a definite understanding, preferably in writing, that old shoes, old clothes, old magazines, even old newspapers may be discarded, or else he should have a house with an ample attic for storage purposes.

After collecting all this heterogeneous material from year to year and not being able to catalogue or adequately take care of it, librarians are prone to groan and carry on fearfully because they cannot complete their work, but that does not deter them from keeping right on begging and collecting more material. Now, here is where their optimism comes in. They seem to believe that next year, or the year after, or at least sometime in the dim future, they will be able to catch up with all this work which they have piled upon themselves. In the meantime they are constantly finding new things which need to be done and this is a sufficient reason for attempting to do them,—new indexing, new clippings, new cataloguing. Librarians are confirmed and, I sometimes think, hopeless optimists.

Librarians are also confirmed individualists. They want to do things for themselves. For example, a librarian would prefer to spend any amount of time compiling a bibliography of child welfare so that she could publish it and call it her own rather than to use a list compiled by another librarian.

Perhaps many will take exception to the traits I have ascribed to librarians. The least, however, I should like to suggest to our modern day realists is that they make a closer study of librarians at first hand when using them as characters.

Young librarians may not without exception be as beautiful as Martie and Maud and Carol, but certainly they have more common sense, more brains, and less sentimentality. The worst that can be said of librarians and perhaps the best, is that they are human, very human. As for myself, I am happy that my lot has been cast among them.

THE NEW YORK PRESS AND ANDREW JOHNSON

MARGUERITE HALL ALBJERG

West Lafayette, Indiana

THERE are some enthusiasts of journalism who maintain that during the past century the press surpassed in influence the dynasties of kings, the teachings of school and college, the preachings of church and platform. However, other more discriminating critics who made no such magnificent concession to the newspapers of the land, still admit that their power has been tremendous and significant, particularly in the realm of politics. Nevertheless, an eminent scholar on the Reconstruction period felt that for this era a historian might be largely independent of the daily press since the work of the times was done by Congress, which represented the public sentiment of the North; but he added that the Congressmen and Senators were industrious newspaper readers and probably read an able New York journal which spoke for their party, in addition to the papers of their district and state.¹ Therefore, perhaps it seems reasonable that we should investigate this important source of Congressional opinion and also note the rôle it played in that bitter legislative-executive battle of the late sixties.

There were several factors which contributed to the pre-eminent position of the New York City press. First, its geographical location was advantageous for the receiving of foreign news and also for the collection and distribution of news of the eastern states. Second, and more important, was the remarkable group of newspaper men who dominated the press of the city, namely: Bennett, Greeley, Raymond, Dana and Bryant. These newspaper magnates were eager for the development of the journalistic profession as well as for the advancement of their individual papers; but their (especially Bennett and Greeley) most coveted ambition was to edit a sheet of formidable authority and of wide influence. To them affluence was second to influence. The years following the

¹ James Ford Rhodes, *Historical Essays* (New York, 1909), pp. 94-95.

Civil War saw the close of the era of personal journalism. It was now evident that the rivalry engendered by the daily competition of these forceful men not only resulted in vituperative editorials and in improving the means for gathering, printing and distributing news, but also in a bitter and virulent struggle to shape national events during the reconstruction conflict. A litterateur and one-time journalist sensed this strategic importance of the New York newspapers when he wrote in 1871: "[Its] papers reach the controlling minds of the country. They are found in all reading-rooms, exchanges, bank parlors, insurance offices, counting rooms, hotels and wherever else the ruling men of the country congregate. But, above all, they are, and must be, in all the newspaper offices, subject to the scissors. . . . The grand reason why the New York papers have national importance is that it is chiefly through them that the art of journalism is to be perfected. They are daily copies for all editors to follow. . . . It therefore devolves upon the journalists of that city to teach the journalists of the United States their vocation. It is this fact which invests the press of New York with such importance, and makes it so well worth considering."²

While the Civil War had caused the news column to supersede the editorial page in the eyes of the public, still in the strife and difficulties which the discussion of reconstruction problems brought to the fore, might be seen again the ascendancy of the editorial. Once more the daily reader turned first to the editorial page, then back to the news of the front page.³ It is perhaps worth noting that all but five of these metropolitan papers were preëminently political journals. They were divided about equally as to numbers in their political affiliation. Yet four out of six of the important morning dailies were Republican, making even in that Democratic city the greater newspaper prestige for the Republicans. Only

² James Parton, *Famous Americans of Recent Times* (Boston, 1871), p. 266.

³ All the New York City English dailies from February, 1865 to February, 1869 have been used in the preparation of this article. In the citing of them, the practice of the New York Public Library has been followed, that is, using the front page title as the name of the paper. This title has been frequently abbreviated in the body of the article.

two sheets might be called rightly Copperhead. There was really no ultra-liberal publication in the entire group; the *Tribune* would probably come the nearest to so qualifying, yet it, like the rest, was fundamentally conservative on most things. As an aspiring dictator and as a purveyor of political ideas, the *Tribune* surpassed all, while in sheer newspaper enterprise, *The Herald* had no peer. In general make-up, news, editorials and most of all in journalistic vigor, the evening papers were out-done easily by the morning dailies.

This efficient, powerful and aggressive press with intense but varying emotions, watched the accidental ascent to the presidency of a Southerner whose previous record left much to conjecture. Hugh McCulloch, Secretary of the Treasury under Andrew Johnson, insisted that no public man had been so imperfectly understood and that none had been more difficult to comprehend than had his Chief.⁴ However, there were two fundamental traits which might be seen always in Johnson's tempestuous career. First, his hatred of the aristocracy. Some prefer to stress his love of the common man, but his often mentioned devotion to the masses and his labor for their uplift seemed to be a less dynamic force than his bitter eagerness to crush the aristocrats. He was said to have "hated a gentleman by instinct."⁵ In a conversation with Governor Palmer, who remarked that the North opposed slavery because they thought it unjust and wished the slaves freed, Johnson replied: "D—n the negroes; I am fighting those traitorous aristocrats, their masters."⁶ The other dominating characteristic was his unfailing devotion to the Union. He was ever loyal to the cause of the North during the War and he was equally eager to bring about a reunited nation during the days of reconstruction. But his vagaries of temperament did not equip him for the handling of so delicate a task. Johnson was a man of enormous ambition, of remarkable persistency and unquestioned honesty; these qualities were his mainstays in his strug-

⁴ Hugh McCulloch, *Men and Measures of Half a Century*, (New York, 1888), p. 220.

⁵ Clifton R. Hall, *Andrew Johnson* (Princeton, 1916), p. 221.

⁶ John M. Palmer, *Personal Recollections* (Cincinnati, 1901), p. 127.

gle up from poverty and insignificance. His youthful existence bred in him combativeness but not tolerance, resourcefulness but lack of tact, a ready reply but not dignified utterances. A self-made man who bore the marks of his constant struggle for recognition, narrow, distrustful, sometimes crude but fearless, honest, keen, ambitious and patriotic—such was Andrew Johnson. He has been picturesquely characterized as a “strong and sturdy pine in the forest, which has grown up distorted by some rocky obstruction, twisted out of shape and crooked in the trunk, and yet vigorous at the core.”⁷

Neither a worried and distressed country nor an alert, powerful and ambitious press would permit the new President to approach his problem or to formulate his policy without appeals, advice and attacks as abundant as they were contradictory. A people weary, nervous and suspicious after four years of war read with agitated and fearful hearts the pages of their journals to see the manner in which their President was solving reconstruction. Equally restive, the newspaper world—and most particularly its leader, the press of New York City—was ever on the *qui vive* to fashion the presidential program and the nation's mind to its own widely divergent purposes. Often these great journals, especially *The Herald* and *The Times*, insisted that their mission was to reflect popular sentiment, but this was rather a device to convince the public that the paper's views were those of the masses and thereby win those people who felt they must be with the majority. The President's task was foredoomed to unpopularity but not to the obloquy into which his own tactless and obstinate acts plunged it. His inability to recognize the incomparable value to his cause of the support of the influential New York journals which might have popularized his moderate reconstruction program, was one of his most costly errors.

When Andrew Johnson became President, the New York press viewed the situation dubiously. In a very short while, however, it began to speak kindly of the new President and

⁷ James Schouler, *History of United States of America Under the Constitution* (7 vols., New York, 1908-1913), VII, p. 142, quoting Charles Dickens.

by the summer of 1865 it was backing him. Horace Greeley's *Tribune*, a sheet of much force in the Middle West and of more prestige outside than within Manhattan,⁸ early felt that Johnson had "rare qualifications for the vast responsibility" because he knew the Rebellion, understood how far it had perverted the South, and would understand how to temper justice with mercy; therefore, there would be "a very general disposition to acquiesce in his conditions and limitations in the firm belief that he . . . will be as rigorous as he must, and no more so."⁹ Three days later, the *Tribune* announced that "President Johnson has the loyal states at his back as no President since Monroe has had them; he can carry thousands for a definite, vigorous policy who would have opposed that identical course if propounded by his lamented predecessor."¹⁰ Greeley's journal was sincerely eager for humane treatment of the South; it advocated negro suffrage, for it thought that the only means by which the former slave could preserve and protect his freedom, but it also hoped to win the hearty assent of the South to emancipation.¹¹ Doubtless the *Tribune* desired to encourage the President to pursue a non-vindictive program while at the same time it would persuade the North of the wisdom of his course and thus effect a rehabilitation of the somewhat disrupted Republican party. Henry Raymond, the brilliant, well balanced, politically ambitious editor of *The Times*, saw in Johnson a unique opportunity to strengthen the hold of moderate Republicans on federal affairs and perhaps through him to bind to the Northern Republicans those southern Unionists who were formerly Democrats. To Raymond, political expediency usually took precedence over moral issues. *The Times*, normally the most sane and reasonable of all the New York papers, warned the North against being too exacting of the South, while it commended that section for its frank and manly acceptance of defeat.¹² It urged Congress to make

⁸ Interesting statistics on the *Tribune's* circulation may be found in the issue of Sept. 17, Oct. 8, 1866; Feb. 3, June 17, Sept. 16, 1868.

⁹ *New York Tribune*, April 22, 1865.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, April 25, 1865.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, April 3, June 14, 1865; May 23, 1867.

¹² *The New York Times*, May 3, June 12, 1865.

the most of this splendid spirit of the ex-Confederates by "using it, while still fresh, to recement the Union," adding that the Union party would belie its name if it failed to sustain the President.¹³ *The Times* even agreed that Johnson's and Lincoln's policies were the same and therefore the true way of honoring the martyred President was by supporting Johnson and bringing his predecessor's work to a successful completion.¹⁴

The World and *Daily News*, which appealed to the Democratic aristocracy and masses of New York, did not regard Vice-President Johnson and President Johnson in the same light. While Lincoln lived, they saw in "Andy" Johnson "a debauched demagogue," a member of the heinous Republican Party, and a man without political principles but one who "could bellow his bastard 'loyalty' loudly."¹⁵ *The World* maintained that besides wanting the character and culture of a statesman, Mr. Johnson lacked the sentiments and bearing of a gentleman. ". . . And to think that only one frail life stands between this insolent, clownish drunkard and the presidency. . . . Should this Andrew Johnson become his [Lincoln's] successor, the decline and fall of the American republic would smell as rank in history as that of the Roman Empire under such atrocious monsters in human shape as Nero and Caligula."¹⁶ But a change of attitude was effected after Johnson took over the direction of the government, for they now perceived the possibility of reclaiming him for the Democratic party by persuading him that its principles were those he was struggling to maintain, by convincing the Democratic rank and file that he was their natural chief and leader, and by conniving to make the Republicans believe he had identified himself with his former party.¹⁷ These two journals mentioned Johnson as a presidential possibility for 1868 as early as the fall of 1865.¹⁸ In an exceedingly astute editorial, the *Daily News*

¹³ *Ibid.*, Nov. 23, 1865.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Aug. 15, 1866.

¹⁵ *New York Daily News*, March 7, 1865. *The World*, March 9, 1865.

¹⁶ *The World*, March 7, 1865.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Sept. 12, 25, Oct. 3, 19, 1865.

¹⁸ *The World*, Oct. 19, 1865. *New York Daily News*, July, 1865.

made a clever bid for the President's support by flattering and cajoling this anti-aristocrat and pro-Unionist. It paid tribute to his statesmanlike and patriotic record; it applauded his moral courage and his withstanding of great temptations; it skilfully mentioned how all factions looked to him for the realization of their aspirations and yet how he had maintained his aloofness from the counsels of the corrupt and had listened to the promptings of his conscience; it alluded to his breaking the trammels of party and retaining a splendid independence of all groups in his desire to serve the common weal; it suggested artfully that his natural alliance was with the people whom he could trust and the majority of whom, both North and South, were Democratic in sentiment; "Your nature", it concluded, "is Democratic; the people know that it is so; obey the instincts of your nature and the people will trust you and support you."¹⁹ But eager as Andrew Johnson was for preferment, he could not subordinate to a workable compromise his obstinate convictions and his intense prejudices, for he lacked the adaptability of an opportunist as well as the flexible-mindedness of a real statesman. His adherence to state's rights and his opposition to Negro suffrage inclined him to favor the Democratic party; but his intense nationalism, his loyal Union sentiments, and his acceptance of the nomination for the Vice-Presidency held him in the Republican fold; his political ambitions, his presidential aspirations for 1868, together with his hatred of southern aristocratic leaders, prompted him to try to organize a National Union party composed of loyal Democrats and conservative Republicans.

But it was with Bennett's *Herald* that the President maintained his closest connection. This paper was both denounced and feared by its journalistic contemporaries. Henry Adams has called it "a despotic empire admitting no personality but that of Bennett."²⁰ Goldwin Smith maintained that its editorials were always before the eye;²¹ F. P. Blair, Sr., insisted that

¹⁹ *New York Daily News*, Oct. 17, 1865.

²⁰ *The Education of Henry Adams* (Boston, 1918), p. 244.

²¹ James Parton, *Famous Americans of Recent Times* (Boston, 1871), p. 267, quoting Goldwin Smith.

"whatever may be thought of this fickle print, it is a power in the body politic through its vast circulation", and he did his utmost to get its support for the Seymour-Blair ticket in 1868;²² even George W. Childs of the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* admitted that *The Herald* had the largest circulation of any American daily, while the President of the United States conceded that "there is no man in America who can exercise more power in fixing the government upon a firm and enduring foundation than you [Bennett] can."²³ This iconoclastic but shrewd journalist, James Gordon Bennett, so edited his paper that its conservatism on questions of religion and suffrage, its middle course on reconstruction, its non-partisanship in politics appealed to the conservative element in society; by its sensational news, its vivid realism—its acceptance of human nature as it is—it won the masses; by its timely discussions of sports, fashions and social items it attracted the "Smart Set." Thus, it might be said truly that Bennett, more than any other man, caused people in large numbers to read newspapers.²⁴ By its almost uncanny understanding of the public, this sheet usually managed to anticipate the popular will and thus be always with the majority. This particular characteristic caused *The Herald's* editorial blessing to be coveted by every aspiring statesman, for in a democracy we must always reckon as considerable that portion of the masses whose only political effort consists in trying to pick the winning side and attaching themselves thereto. Indeed this paper commanded a sizable following because of its record in picking winners. W. B. Phillips, a leading editorial writer for *The Herald* and a frequent and intimate correspondent of Andrew Johnson, wrote confidentially to the President: "The Herald always endeavors to go with the strongest party and side when its editor discovers which [that] is. . . . Its policy

²² John Bigelow, *The Life of Samuel J. Tilden* (2 vols., New York, 1895), I, pp. 240-243.

²³ *Andrew Johnson Manuscript Collection* (Library of Congress), letter of George W. Childs to F. P. Blair, p. 2204; letter of President Johnson to J. G. Bennett, pp. 7259-60.

²⁴ George Howard Payne, *History of Journalism in United States* (New York, 1920), Introduction, p. xv.

is not to stem the current but go with it."²⁵ Therefore it was not strange that Johnson should solicit Bennett's support nor that the editor—ever eager to extend his influence as well as his paper's circulation—was at first both helpful and attentive to the President's policy. In the spring and summer of 1865 this journal found much to commend in the record and acts of the Chief Executive. It compared him favorably with Oliver Cromwell and Andrew Jackson and not only insisted that it expected great things from him but also maintained "as Joshua was to Moses, so we expect Andrew Johnson to be as the successor of Abraham Lincoln."²⁶ But quick as was Bennett's paper to support what it thought would be an able Chief and a successful policy, it was just as quick to note the President's inability to comprehend the indiscretion of his own acts and it acted accordingly. When Congressional opposition to the Executive began to assume definite form in the spring of 1866, *The Herald* through its editorials and by private correspondence admonished Johnson to avoid a conflict, to direct public attention to other channels, and to rid himself of an unreliable Cabinet.²⁷ In this last respect Bennett's paper differed from Greeley's journal, which insisted that the salvation of the country depended on the Cabinet members retaining their posts and restraining a blundering Chief.²⁸ Bennett regarded the Congressional elections of 1866 as decisive. He wished Johnson therefore to develop some striking policy (concerning foreign affairs, his Cabinet or some other matter) that would arouse the public mind, and present a sharply defined issue that would awaken the people in time to influence the election in the President's favor.²⁹ *The Herald* was willing to support aggressively such a maneuver but Johnson refused to play the game, for neither his unyielding principles

²⁵ *Johnson Manuscripts*, letter of W. B. Phillips to President Johnson, pp. 14369-72.

²⁶ *The New York Herald*, April 16, 17; Oct. 12, 1865.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, Aug. 14, 1865; Feb. 23, May 21, Sept. 24, 1866. *Johnson Manuscripts*, letters of W. B. Phillips to President Johnson, pp. 9386-89, 11474-77, 12586-89, 16345-48.

²⁸ *New York Tribune*, Oct. 11, 1867.

²⁹ *Johnson Manuscripts*, letter of W. B. Phillips to President Johnson, pp. 11474-77.

nor his inelastic mind permitted him to launch so different and complex a scheme. Bennett's journal preferred a middle course in reconstruction and a modified Negro suffrage, so it never became so bitter an opponent of the President as did the *Tribune*. It was too wary, however, to continue championing a personage who could not heed discreet political counsel. After the Radicals carried the election of 1866, it wished Johnson to consider the jury's verdict as rendered and to act in a suitable manner.³⁰

The *Tribune* ceased to support the President after he vetoed the Freedmen's Bureau Bill. When it saw that he would not support Negro suffrage, which it regarded as essential to successful reconstruction, and when it recognized that he could not unify the northern Republicans, then it stopped upholding his policy to its readers. Shortly it spoke of Johnson's defying Congress, of his responsibility for the New Orleans Riots, and cited his Swing-Round the Circle tour as showing that he had succeeded Lee as leader of the Rebels and had now made a masterly retreat into politics with headquarters at the White House.³¹ Such editorials were as certain to undermine the President's prestige with the *Tribune's* followers as it was sure to draw the Radicals to the support of its columns. Still, Greeley wrote John Russell Young, managing editor of the paper, not to exasperate Johnson and the Southerners, for such action might retard Negro suffrage.³² However Young's correspondence clearly revealed a startling intimacy with the Congressional Radicals and a growing assurance on their part that the *Tribune's* columns were their own.³³ When this potent daily turned its editorial guns upon him, Johnson not merely faced a mighty foe but also an enemy who knew how to gather many recruits to its standard. The *Times*, whose influence was not so far-reaching, supported the President longer than did either *The Herald* or *Tribune*, but by the late fall of 1866 it lamented his refusal to accept the

³⁰ *The New York Herald*, Sept. 15, Dec. 14, 1866.

³¹ *New York Tribune*, Feb. 23, 26, Aug. 1, Sept. 8, Oct. 29, 1866.

³² John Russell Young Manuscript Collection (Library of Congress), letters of Horace Greeley to John Russell Young, Nov. 19, Dec. 22, 1866.

³³ *Ibid.*, letters for 1867-68.

people's verdict. It regretted his devotion to the "consistency" of his record and his little respect for the opinions of others; "He may be honest; he may be conscientious, he may have all the virtues; and yet he may ruin his country."⁸⁴ Even *The World* realizing that Andrew Johnson would no more capitulate to the Democrats than to the Republicans, used its editorial page to warn the public against identifying the President with the Democratic party, for such a move would render the party responsible for his "blunders and mismanagement perpetuated against its [Democratic party] judgment and in contempt of its wishes."⁸⁵ The Democratic *Evening Express* continuously supported Johnson, but its editorial policy was of such minor consideration with its editors that its opinions created scarcely a ripple on the great sea of public opinion. The *Daily News* lost interest in the chief Executive when it saw he could not be allied with the Democrats and thereafter gave scant space to his reconstruction program or his impeachment. The *Journal of Commerce* and *Commercial Advertiser* were neither outstandingly for nor against the President; their journalistic influence on political matters was small, although Thurlow Weed who became editor of the latter in 1867 was personally a potent force in political circles. *The Sun*, because of its large clientele among the laboring classes, was considered a great asset to the party which could secure its influence. However, it never rendered Johnson much service, for while it gave him moderate support until early in 1867, still it was never an enthusiastic booster. In 1868 it explained the President's conduct on the ground of his being insane and an opium addict and suggested interposing to the impeachment articles the plea of insanity, for it believed this defense could be made successfully. *The Evening Post* under the able and dignified leadership of William C. Bryant, could not compete for the patronage of the daily laborers the novel news and occasionally bizarre editorials of Dana's journal (*The Sun*). However the *Post's* influence was considerable among a limited class of aristocratic intellectuals in both parties. It upheld

⁸⁴ *The New York Times*, June 15, 1867.

⁸⁵ *The World*, Sept. 12, 1867.

the Executive until the summer of 1866, but it was never very ardent. A year later it declared that "he purposely and with insane obstinacy, stands between the country and peace."²⁷ Having alienated every important New York daily by 1867, and most of them a year earlier, Andrew Johnson not only had lost his right arm, figuratively speaking, but he might have read his political doom in the change of front of this powerful metropolitan press.

All the New York papers with one exception regarded the Impeachment Trial with indifference as to Johnson's fate, although they felt such a procedure set a bad precedent. The *Tribune*, however, was active in trying to formulate a public opinion that would force all Republican Senators to vote for impeachment or resign from the party. J. R. Young's correspondence during these months revealed an intimate connection between the ideas of the Radicals' leaders (especially Schuyler Colfax) and the editorial page of the *Tribune*. But the decline of the President's prestige was so complete that even the *Tribune's* vehement and denunciatory efforts failed to arouse the people to alarm, lest Johnson be acquitted. The view of the *Commercial Advertiser* well expressed the attitude of most of the New York press and not improbably that of the country at large when it said: "The President provoked, if he did not seek, this form of proceeding [impeachment]. He sowed the storm and must reap the whirlwind. It is, nevertheless, painful to witness the right so badly upheld that the wrong prevails."²⁸

Andrew Johnson had been indeed fortunate upon becoming President in having a record and a character that appealed to the various factions of the New York press. The Radicals thought that his war record and his early authorization of Jefferson Davis' arrest indicated his sympathy with them; his support of the moderate program of the Tennessee constitutional convention of 1864-65 gave the conservative Republicans hope of attaching him; while his pre-war record and his

²⁷ *The Sun*, Mar. 7, 1868.

²⁸ *The Evening Post*, Aug. 7, 1867.

²⁹ *New York Commercial Advertiser*, Feb. 26, 1868.

southern environment encouraged the Democrats to think that he might be reclaimed.³⁹ All were eager to support him; all were anxious to claim his leadership. Still he seemed unable to utilize his strategic position. His correspondence with *The Herald* showed that he at least sensed the importance of journalistic influence, but this dyed-in-the-wool Jacksonian Democrat could not bring himself to accept moderate Republican principles, nor to compromise with the Radicals, nor to identify himself with the Democratic party, nor even to give up his presidential ambitions which he hoped to attain through his leadership of a National Union party. The latter might possibly have been achieved had he been more of a compromiser, or more of an astute politician. But his obstinacy, his unbending convictions and his gnawing ambition so blinded his natural shrewdness that he made an enemy of Congress, opponents of his Cabinet members, and alienated the most powerful press of the country, which fact contributed largely to his hopelessly antagonizing the people. With such opposition he could not help but fail in his most sincere desire—to reunite a nation torn by civil war.

³⁹ Curtis Nettels, "Andrew Johnson and the South," in *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXV (1926), pp. 57-60.

BOOK REVIEWS

JAMES BRYCE. By H. A. L. Fisher. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927. 2 vols., xi, 360 + 360 pp.

England has never produced a finer type of liberal than James Bryce. Indeed he was unique in that his view of life was international rather than national. "I think I am a citizen of the world", he once said; and these words summarize his biography. His instinctive love of the universal rather than the local was evident during his youth in his phenomenal mastery of the classics. It was manifest in his persistent love of nature which led him to visit practically every accessible region of the globe save the Malay Peninsula, Borneo and Java. His sympathies were always with the oppressed, far and near; his mature intellectual interest was comparative government and institutions in modern democracies. The time has not come for a final estimate of his influence, but a friend and scholar in these volumes has made a lasting interpretation of his personality as well as an excellent running sketch of his career.

Bryce's mind was objective, always turning to things concrete rather than to abstractions. Much of his information in his marvelous books was derived from conversations with the lowly as well as the great. Nature also gave him many clues to the secret of human actions and institutions. Such was the source of his strength and such also was the source of his limitations. Because of this love of the objective he never produced the great historical work that was expected of him, a history of mediaeval Germany. Here again is an explanation of his singular lack of interest in the conflict of religious ideals that disturbed so many of his friends. To his last day his faith was that of his Scotch Presbyterian ancestors.

Was he a leader of men? Hardly, for his mind was too scientific, too given to precise measurements for him to make quick decisions in hours of national crisis, hours when the natural leaders of men instinctively decide and then point the way. Yet in certain great movements of international and domestic significance he did exert an important influence.

He never grew old, save in body, for his mind belonged to the great universe round and about him. His last words were spoken one night; "I will go out and look at the stars": by morning Death had taken him, quietly and without a struggle. As one reads Mr. Fisher's pages the question rises whether this new age of the twentieth century has in it

the forces to produce a mind so universal in its reaches, a spirit so filled with moral power, such an apostle of liberty. Bryce was the last of the great Victorians.

W. K. B.

JAMES KIRKE PAULDING, *VERSATILE AMERICAN*. By Amos L. Herold. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926.

The time seemingly has come for careful reviews of the work of minor writers of the pre-Civil War period in American literature. James Kirke Paulding has for long been regarded as an author secondary only to Irving, Cooper, and Bryant, and well in the front of those ranks which included Halleck, Kennedy, Simms, and innumerable others. He was a novelist, a social and literary critic, a short-story writer before the days of Hawthorne and Poe, and in some slight measure, a poet. Yet, up to the present time, the only biography of him has been a clumsy and apologetic compilation thrown together by his son; his works have never been published in anything approximating a complete and definitive edition, and critical estimates have been scattered and also lacking in a comprehensive view of his diverse literary productions.

The sub-title of the present volume is especially well-chosen. It furnishes the key both to the variety of Paulding's activities, and to his literary position. His versatility was his most notable characteristic and he experienced both the advantages and the disadvantages of that fact. Like Defoe, he was an innovator in many fields in which even his contemporaries out-did him, but, unlike Defoe, he attained to pre-eminence in none of them. The best that can be said for Paulding is that he is of the first importance in American literary history and that he produced numerous works which are at least worth reconsideration. He does not deserve the oblivion which his reputation has suffered, even when judged in absolute terms.

This importance of Paulding in American literary history is the most striking fact which comes to the reader of Dr. Herold's study. In an age of romanticism, when Scott and Cooper were vying for international honors, Paulding had the courage to acknowledge a discipleship to Fielding and to plead for the most extreme sort of literal realism in narrative. His own work in the novel and short-story did not fulfill his creed, for his journalistic sense made him compromise his position and attempt a blending of the two extremes of classic severity and romantic enthusiasm. Nevertheless Dr. Herold has made out a good case for this "author of seventy tales," and chronicler of early times in New York and Kentucky. The tales, he says, "exhibit a sturdy virility and a fine sense of human values. . . . He introduced a large intellectual element

—wit, satire, and reflection. . . . For Paulding (life was) the diverting adventure of a serenely self-reliant soul." If all this be true, surely students of the realism of Howells and James owe Paulding a backward glance.

As literary critic, Paulding's work was therefore important for its statement of a realistic creed, but it was lacking in quantity; as a poet his position may be casually dismissed. As social critic, however, even Dr. Herold does him only partial justice. That part of his time which he did not devote to journalism was filled by the duties of minor government posts and he was alert to the elements which made up the American political mind of the day, almost to the point of obsession. His literal attitude, tinged always with a satire which had little sting and much humor in it, made him an unusually penetrating and observant critic of what was happening about him, and his journalistic training led him to figurative expressions of his comments and beliefs. In the pen war with England, following the War of 1812, his was second only to the devastating attacks of Cooper, and in his comments upon the provincialism of the American mind, his wit was lighter and his thrusts of almost as straight an aim as those of his greater contemporary. Paulding's controversial documents, like Cooper's, do not deserve the oblivion to which partisan feelings of their own day consigned them. They are evidence of the somewhat over-aggressive demand for mental as well as political independence which gives Cooper his pioneer position in the development of the American national spirit in literature.

Although apparently a biography, this summary of the work of James Kirke Paulding must therefore be considered rather as a critical estimate. The task of weighing the literary product of a secondary author is exceedingly difficult; it leads almost invariably to apology on the one hand and to over-praise on the other. To both these faults Dr. Herold is subject in his running commentaries and in his criticisms of individual works. His larger view of his problem, however, as demonstrated in his summaries, is better balanced and more clear-headed. He succeeds in placing Paulding with a reasonable degree of finality in his niche of excellence with reference to his American contemporaries. If he had, by an imaginative effort, realized more fully Paulding's personality, his work might have become a biography. As it is, he has succeeded only in analysing the elements in Paulding's literary product, viewed chronologically, and he has produced an admirable critical review rather than a living portrait.

Swarthmore College.

ROBERT E. SPILLER.

THE MECHANISM OF THE MODERN STATE: A TREATISE ON THE SCIENCE AND ART OF GOVERNMENT. By Sir John A. R. Marriott. New York: Oxford University Press, 1927. 2 vols., xxiv, 596, xiv, 595 pp.

Characteristically enough for a Conservative member of the British parliament, Sir John Marriott begins his preface to these two stout volumes, which supposedly deal comparatively with the science of government, with a confession that "the primary purpose of this book is to set forth the actual working of the British constitution." That is to say, for him, the modern state is the British state, one which, perhaps to a greater degree than others, is *sui generis*. He introduces chapters on and references to the governments of other countries chiefly in order to point out what he conceives to be their differences from that of Great Britain. It is not surprising, therefore, that his comment on the foreign governments is for the most part superficial, save where the second chambers of the legislatures are concerned. If the book has merit at all it is because of what it contains on the British constitution.

Even on that subject certain doubts arise. To be helpful, a book on the English constitution should have something to say (1) by way of history, (2) in the form of analysis or critical comment, or (3) as a report of personal experience. Sir John Marriott has had experience as a member of important committees in the House of Commons and has a wide acquaintance along public men. Therefore his description of the actual working of the legislative body is pertinent and helpful. But all he has to say on that subject could be contained in a single volume much thinner than either of these.

Those who are familiar with his previous writings do not need to be told that Sir John has read widely in British history and politics and that he has written some books of substantial merit. But he depends too largely on the labors of other men to be able to contribute much himself to an understanding of history, and he lacks the insight that might enable him to illuminate by philosophical generalization or analytical comment obscure and imponderable aspects of government, as Bagehot did in his day. Moreover, one concludes the task of reading through these volumes with a feeling that they are planned without very careful thought and executed at spare intervals in a considerable number of years. They are replete with repetitions, postponed questions, and details that were not corrected after they were written to conform to changes of condition that have subsequently taken place.

Perhaps the historical element in the book is its weakest, though naturally its largest part. Sir John has had little direct acquaintance with the sources for the history of the seventeenth and eighteenth cen-

turies, when the machinery and doctrines of the executive and legislative departments of the government were largely shaped. His generalizations on these subjects reveal a maximum of complacency with very little insight to support it.

Finally, one wonders how seriously a book on the modern British state deserves to be taken which leaves largely out of account both the Church and the press. An attempt to govern Great Britain without the assistance of the press would soon reveal the vital part it plays, and in dealing with a subject so little formally legal as the British constitution it is not easy to defend a neglect of the press so complete that a reference to it scarcely finds its way into the index. And it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the thing that stands most in the way of an understanding of British institutions by foreigners is the failure of writers in the past to give intelligent attention to the Church.

On the whole, one is not sorry to have read Sir John's volumes, and there are probably enough gleanings to justify the time required. Yet it is difficult to imagine the audience to which they are addressed and questionable whether their perusal can be recommended as a profitable undertaking.

W. T. LAPRADE.

IL PENTAMERONE OR THE TALE OF TALES. Being a Translation by Sir Richard Burton, K. C. M. G., from Giovanni Batiste Basile. New York, Boni & Liveright, 1927. Pp. xxiii, 456.

Next to Boccaccio's *Decameron*, this is the most famous collection of Italian tales and ranks with the *Canterbury Tales* and the French *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*. Like them, it imitates the general scheme of the *Decameron*. To amuse his wife, a prince summons to his palace the women story-tellers of the city. From the crowd he chooses ten who are to tell a tale apiece for five days. Each of the first four days' allotment of stories is followed by an 'eclogue' or dialogue satirizing the foibles of human-kind. Many old favorites are found among the stories here, some of them under strange titles and in strange dress. Cinderella, Puss-in-Boots and Snow-White may be cited as examples.

The original title of the collection was "Lo cunto de li cunti overo lo trattenemiento de' peccerille" (The Tale of Tales or the Diversion of Little Ones). Croce, in the introduction to his classic Italian edition of 1925, says that it was not composed for children, as Grimm and others, taking its jocose title literally, believed, but for grown men, lettered and sophisticated, and it is to be hoped that this is so, for many of the expressions and situations are too strong for our ideas of mental food for safe digestion in the formative years of youth.

William A. Drake in his foreword to the volume says (p. xiii): "Basile's style may indeed surprise the unwary. It is florid with all the extravagance of conceit which none of the prose writers of the Seicento, even Chiabrera, Testa, and Guarini, seem to have quite escaped; but the physical bases of Basile's style, if we may so characterise the roots which bind his genius to the Neapolitan soil, prevent him from at any time descending to the empty affectations to which his contemporaries were only too prone. Basile's prose is redolent of Naples, with its vivid exuberance, its eager loquacity, its vehemence in appreciation or censure, the turbulent abundance and flexibility of its metaphor, its occasional robust indelicacy, its Rabelaisian gusto in the savouring of words, and the loving intimacy of the local allusions with which it abounds. There is not a line, not an image in the book which is not perfectly in the spirit of the Neapolitan people."

Basile, who with his friend Cortese founded Neapolitan dialect literature, wrote these tales in the dialect and probably read them first to one of the Academies. He died in 1632 and the *Pentamerone* was not published until 1634-6. It was reprinted many times in the original, translated into Bolognese and Italian, then later into French, German and English.

This volume, one of the handsome numbers of the Black and Gold Library, is a reprint of the original English edition and that of 1893, long out of print. It is a spirited translation and maintains much of the racy flavor of the original. It is in the main a faithful rendering, but some of the coarse expressions have been toned down or pruned. It generally maintains an archaic flavor, but occasionally does not when it would have been possible; for instance, the word "kilogram" is used where "pound" would do (p. 181). There are occasional mistranslations; for instance, "a fastidious student" (p. 212) should read "a troublesome student", and the title of the Fourth Diversion of the Third Day, "Sapia the Glutton" (p. 226) should be "Prudent Riccarda". But these are minor matters and will not detract from the enjoyment of the stories. Any lover of folk-stories or student of folk-ways will find this volume a valuable addition to his library.

F. A. G. COWPER.

FRANCE AND AMERICA. By Andre Tardieu. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1927. Pp. viii, 312. \$3.00.

The author of the present volume is a distinguished French scholar, historian, and statesman. He has made a frank and honest attempt to present the fundamental differences in tradition, social ideals, and

political organization between France and America as a scientific basis for the proper understanding of the present unsatisfactory relations between the two countries.

The book contains six long chapters with suggestive titles and each chapter except the last is relieved by appropriately headed subdivisions. These breaks and a brilliant style make the work most interesting reading to one with a fair knowledge of the history of the two countries and their past relationships. Others will find it rather heavy in places.

The first chapter deals with the contrasts which appear in the history and temperament of the two nations. Here the author's main contention is that France and the United States are not natural allies. "The fact is", says Tardieu, "that conditions in France and the United States are not only dissimilar but opposite; their past makes understanding not easy but difficult; geographically, historically, politically, nationally, socially, and intellectually, contrasts are more frequent than similarities."

The second chapter briefly surveys two thousand years of French life, giving special emphasis to the regions around Soissons and Laon which he contends are the very heart of France. Here, decade after decade, one may witness struggle, suffering, faith, endurance, repeated devastation and reconstruction, the long unfolding of French history, the evolution of French life and character; and having witnessed these, may understand French nationalism and passion against the invader.

In the third chapter is set forth the attitude of the people of the United States toward the World War and their belated participation in the struggle. The ebb and flow of American sentiment, the facility of private coöperation are brilliantly portrayed. With regard to the official motives of the United States in entering the war, Tardieu says: "America was at war. . . . From the first day the United States insisted that it was not an ally, that it would act only as an associate; that the war aims of the others would not be its war aims; that it would have its own war aims from which nothing would turn it. . . . This state of mind remained unchanged. In the height of military enthusiasm there was always distrust of European politics. Crusade? Many believed it in good faith. But facts are against them. Had it been a crusade it would have begun in August, 1914, not in April, 1917. No, the war President Wilson declared was an American war, American in inception, American in spirit. No, Wilson declared a narrowly national war. . . ."

Then comes a chapter on the recent reconstruction period. The terrible devastation of France by the Germans is vividly portrayed under

the caption of "The Wrath of Attila", and the almost insuperable difficulties of restoring the ravished areas are presented in a most impressive fashion. The efforts of the French government so far have fallen short of success. The only region where restoration has been almost completely effected is the comparatively small area turned over to the American Committee for Devastated France.

Chapter V dwells upon the political difficulties which arose between the two governments and peoples during and after the World War. In this and the last chapter of the book both the United States and France are severely censured, but the United States most of all. With reference to the latter there is no mincing of words.

"There is no country", writes Tardieu, "with which international co-operation is more difficult; no diplomacy at once more overbearing and evasive. The United States blames other countries for this difficulty of getting on together. In point of fact every time co-operation with the United States has broken down, the United States herself has been most to blame.

"And", the Frenchman adds, "this instability is accounted for by a weakness. Convinced of their moral superiority as compared with the Old World, Americans are equally conscious of their political inferiority. Every one complains that American diplomacy is unequal to European diplomacy. Under the influence of this phobia the United States has constantly underestimated her own strength and lost countless opportunities. Since the armistice, the United States has frittered away the power placed in her hands by economic conditions after the war. . . . Never with such great resources has so puny a policy been pursued, never have more splendid opportunities been missed."

And again: "Errors of judgment and errors of action have cost the United States that wholehearted confidence which Europe reposed in her in 1918. . . . Europe in 1926 has not a kind word for the United States." That is Tardieu's view of the argument carried on in the United States regarding whether we have any friends across the Atlantic.

What would the French have had us do? Submerge our army in those of France and England, cancel the French debt, insist more strongly upon the payment of German indemnities, join the League of Nations, give France a pledge of security against Germany? When in history has a nation appeared that would have assumed such obligations? Not the United States with the sentiment and advantages of isolation, emphasized by geography, Pharisaism and experience; and Tardieu must know this! What remedy would he apply? "Under-

standing, more understanding, and still more understanding". To what end? That Frenchmen may learn to expect little official assistance from the United States and greet with agreeable surprise whatever aid that chances to come; that Americans may know the ardent nationalism of France and the terror of the French frontier? The book is interesting and will probably have a wide sale, but beyond this I can entertain no great optimism.

J. FRED RIPPY.

JUDICIAL CASES CONCERNING AMERICAN SLAVERY. Edited by Helen Tunnick Catterall. (Vol. I. Cases from the Courts of England, Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky). Washington, D. C., 1926. The Carnegie Institution, xiv, 508 pp.

This volume is the most promising contribution to the literature of American slavery made in a generation, not on account of its intrinsic merits but because it is the first of a series of volumes in which will be compiled all the decisions of English and American courts regarding slavery. In the past there have been several compilations of the statute law concerning slavery, but with the exception of Wheeler's *Practical Treatise on the Law of Slavery* (1837) there has been no distinct effort to bring together court decisions on the subject. How serious is this neglect may be realised when we recall that the interpretations of a statute are just as important as the statute itself—and, also, that many questions arose concerning the institution of slavery and the place of the slave in the institution on which the statutes were silent. Indeed, as one ponders the innumerable questions regarding slavery before the courts in the slave-holding states one is prone to conclude that the slave owned the master rather than that the master owned the slave. Moreover, judicial decisions have a place in the history of public opinion; the extent to which they ran counter to the clamor of the multitude or bowed to that clamor, no one can say. Undoubtedly illustrations of both tendencies can be found. Thus no finer example of the survival of the antislavery sentiment of the eighteenth century can be found than William Gaston, of North Carolina, reading into the law the slave's right to self-defense, or Judge O'Neal, of South Carolina, outconstruing a statute in the interest of manumission. And, it should be added, no better illustrations of the subordination of justice to political propaganda can be found than the decisions of certain other judges.

But these remarks are beside the point of this volume. It contains abstracts of the decisions in the English courts and those of Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky, regarding slavery and the slave. The great body of American decisions deals with questions of property right

rather than questions of bondage versus liberty. The latter is the theme of the English decisions, culled from sources familiar and obscure. The distinction of the volume, however, is not the abstracts of cases, but the editorial introductions, especially those to the English and Virginia cases. The former is a masterly survey of the trends in the English decisions, the latter an illuminating interpretation of the origin of slavery in Virginia. Rare it is to find so much detailed information presented with such an appeal to the imagination. We await with keen anticipation the introductions to those volumes which will give the decisions in those states where the pro-slavery sentiment was strongest, especially those instances when court and legislature were of opposite convictions. We also hope that in certain typical cases the abstracts will be more elaborate than those in this volume.

W. K. B.

JEAN PAUL MARAT: A STUDY IN RADICALISM. By Louis R. Gottschalk. New York: Greenberg, Publisher. 1927. Pp. xv, 221.

Marat's is a baffling personality. At least so thought Carlyle, who queries: "Did nature, O poor Marat, as in cruel sport, knead thee out of her *leavings*, and miscellaneous waste clay; and fling thee forth, stepdame-like, a distraction into this distracted eighteenth century?" With this "distraction" Professor Gottschalk sets out to deal judiciously. Much of Marat's career before 1789 is obscure. He did do some creditable work in science and medicine during this time, the author concludes, although one of his most famous remedies upon analysis was "found to be little more than chalk and water".

It is, however, with his political theories and activities that Professor Gottschalk is chiefly concerned. The study reveals the not unusual change from conservatism to radicalism, the transformation of the comfortable, bourgeois Dr. Marat into the fire-eating, head-hunting Friend of the People. There are evidences of few radical ideas before the Revolution. His political philosophy was of the conventional type largely borrowed from Montesquieu and Rousseau. By explaining his change of interest from scientific to political affairs the author gives a real insight into the character and mental attitude of the man. The "striking difference between both the number and the nature of his studies before and after the destruction of his hopes [for admission to the French and Spanish Academies] may be entirely fortuitous, but when linked with what we know of Marat's self-confessed passion for glory and his martyr complex, it leads to the inference that his interest in science was waning toward the end of this decade . . . the Revolution offered him a new outlet for his pent-up *amour de la gloire*."

Marat turned from one expedient to another as the Revolution failed to accomplish all that he felt it should. He was loath to give up the idea of monarchy, for he had little faith in the intelligence of the people and he considered France too large for a republican form of government. When finally convinced that monarchy was impossible, he ran through a veritable gamut of revolutionary proposals—district assemblies, patriotic clubs, a new court for the trial of political offenders later realized in the Revolutionary Tribunal, and a dictator chosen by the people to guide them through the storm of the Revolution. It is true that he accepted the Republic, but only as a *fait accompli*: he did nothing to bring it about. Not until the death of Louis XVI did he declare, "I believe in the Republic at last!" While the plan for a dictatorship was apparently given up, he found a substitute for it in the executive efficiency of the Committees of Public Safety and General Security. These changes were not made without many reversions, for Marat possessed the abandoned inconsistency of all fanatics.

With the establishment of his journal, the *Ami du Peuple*, "whatever spirit of moderation Marat had once possessed had been exhausted". After the Massacre of the Champ de Mars, he hurled defiance at the authorities. "Would that he could rally to his voice two thousand determined men! To save the country he would go at their head to tear out the heart of the infernal Mottier [Lafayette] in the midst of his battalion of slaves. He would go to burn the monarch and his henchmen in his palace. He would go to impale you [the National Assembly] upon your seats and bury you under the flaming débris of your lair." On May 27, 1791, he again prescribed strong medicine: "eleven months ago five hundred heads would have sufficed; to-day fifty thousand would be necessary; perhaps five hundred thousand will fall before the end of the year". It was this "destructive invective" rather than his political ideas, the author maintains, that gave Marat his influence. He was the sleepless assailant of the counter-Revolution in whatever guise it appeared to him. The crest of his influence passed some time before his death. The assassin's knife merely made "a national hero, crowned with a martyr's halo," of one "who was already dying both physically and politically".

Professor Gottschalk is not without sympathy for Marat and at the same time he has been quite successful in his effort to be judicial. There are points upon which some will disagree with him, but on the whole he has presented a true and telling portrait of a man who was a revolutionist with all his might. His study will be welcomed by those interested in the Revolution and students will be grateful for the excellent bibliography.

GEORGE GORDON ANDREWS.

University of Iowa.

BRITISH POLITICS IN TRANSITION. By Edward McChesney Sait and David Prescott Barrows. New York: The World Book Company, 1925. Pp. xvi, 319.

This small volume is one of a series of *Government Handbooks*, being college text-books in government prepared under the joint editorship of David Prescott Barrows and Thomas Harrison Reed.

With a view to providing a "body of current British political literature", the authors have brought together in convenient form material taken both from official documents and from commentaries on present British institutions. Their stated object is not to supply the student of British government with "dogmatic answers to his questionings", but to "raise situations and problems for which he must be trained to frame political estimates and judgments".

The Monarchy, the Cabinet, the Civil Service, the Electorate, the two Houses of Parliament, and Political Parties are each given separate chapters. A final chapter on "Home Rule and Devolution" presents a general view of the problem of devolution, followed by an application to dominion autonomy. The texts (in whole or in part) of well-selected documents such as the Parliament Act (1911), the Representation of the People Act (1918), the Bryce Report on a reformed second chamber (1918), the Montagu-Chelmsford *Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms* (1918), the Milner Report on relations with Egypt (1921), and the existing Treaty between Great Britain and Ireland, should prove directly helpful to students of British government. In view of the number of different topics covered, some of the extracts included have been made rather brief (e.g., that on Guild Socialism, pp. 146-148). It is believed that the usefulness of the volume would have been increased by an index and by a more extended introductory statement at the first of each chapter.

The fact which the authors point out in their introduction, that "any work on government, no matter how authoritative, is probably obsolete in certain particulars as soon as it is written", is illustrated in certain important occurrences in Great Britain since the publication of this volume. This does not detract from the permanent value of the book as an aid to students seeking to understand the workings of British government from texts of laws and reports and the proceedings of public bodies, as well as from descriptive accounts.

ROBERT R. WILSON.

-
s,
-
al
-
n
ne
-
ne
te
ts
on
ed
ne
er
e-
ad
ve
ne
ve
)
n-
at
ny
te
in
is
ok
sh
of



